Gc
974.4
B27h
v.1
1492-1692
1834328

REYNOLDS HISTORICAL
GENEALOGY COLLECTION

ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1833 01092 6019

4.4
7h
1
92-
343



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

https://archive.org/details/historyofmassach1149barr

GENEALOGY COLLECTION

THE

HISTORY OF MASSACHUSETTS.

1492-1692

THE

V.1

COLONIAL PERIOD.

1492-1692

V.I

BY JOHN STETSON BARRY,

MEMBER OF THE MASSACHUSETTS HISTORICAL SOCIETY, AND OF THE NEW ENGLAND HISTORIC-GENEOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

FOURTH EDITION.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR,
FOR SALE AT HIS
Office, No. 4 Cornhill Court.

1834328

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1856, by

JOHN S. BARRY,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

TO

THE HONORABLE

JAMES SAVAGE, LL. D.,

PRESIDENT

OF THE

MASSACHUSETTS HISTORICAL SOCIETY,

FOR THE PAST FOURTEEN YEARS,

WHOSE VALUABLE LABORS HAVE CONTRIBUTED SO LARGELY TO
ELUCIDATE THE EARLY HISTORY OF NEW ENGLAND,
THESE MEMORIALS OF THE FOUNDERS OF
OUR COMMONWEALTH,

ARE RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED,

BY HIS OBLIGED FRIEND,

THE AUTHOR.

INTRODUCTION.

It is with great diffidence that the following volume, the first of a series upon the history of Massachusetts, is submitted to the public. So deeply is the author impressed with the importance of the subject upon which he has essayed to write, and so fully is he aware that to do it justice requires talents of the highest order, he has trembled, at times, for the consequences of his own temerity in engaging in such an undertaking. It is believed, however, that a work like the present is very much needed, and, if authentic in its details, will prove acceptable. Massachusetts has a history of which she may well be proud; and whoever shall succeed in perfectly delineating that history, will render a valuable service to the State. If this sketch falls short of what some other might furnish, no one will more sincerely rejoice than the author in the appearance of a better; but until such shall appear, it is hoped the present will not prove wholly unworthy of attention.

The historian, in our day, can lay little claim to originality in his labors. It is not his province to create facts, but to take those already furnished him, drawn from the best sources, printed and manuscript, contemporary with the events of which they treat. If, in these respects, the present work

shall be found to contain such an abstract, faithful in its character and reliable in its details, the highest ambition of the anthor will be attained.

The acknowledgements of the author are due those gentlemet who have so kindly encouraged his labors, and to the societies which have granted him free access to their historical treasures. Particularly would he express his indebtedness to Messrs. Charles Deane, John Dean, Samuel G. Drake, Frederick Kidder, and J. Wingate Thornton, Esquires, for the loan of rare books and manuscripts relating to the early history of the State; to the Faculty of Harvard College, the Massachusetts, and New England Historical Societies, and the Boston Athenæum, for access to their libraries and manuscripts; and to the Honorable Ephraim M. Wright, Secretary of State, and the Clerks of his office, for access to the Archives of the Commonwealth. Such as the work is, with all its imperfections, it is sent forth in the hope that it may fill a place in the literature of our Commonwealth which has been for some time vacant; and if the public derive that pleasure from its perusal which its preparation has afforded the author, he will feel amply repaid for his labor.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

EARLY VOYAGES. DISCOVERY OF MASSACHUSETTS.

Christopher Columbus—The Cabots and their Voyages—Patent to Warde and others—Portuguese Voyages—Voyages of the French—Revival of the Maritime spirit in England—Gosnold's Voyage—Voyage of Pring—DeMonts' Patent—Voyage of Weymouth—King James's Patent to the Virginia Companies—Colonies at Jamestown and Sagadahoc—Dutch Voyages—John Smith's Voyages—Pestilence among the Indians—Dermer's Voyage and Journey to Pockanokit—The Great Patent for New England. pp. 1—30.

CHAPTER II.

THE REFORMATION. THE PILGRIMS.

Condition of Europe at the opening of the Sixteenth Century—Martin Luther—Progress of the Reformation—England renounces the authority of the Pope—Position of the Reformation in England under Henry VIII.—Accession of Edward VI.—Changes during his reign—Rise of the Puritans—Accession of Mary—The troubles at Frankfort—Accession of Elizabeth—Controversies during her reign—Position of the Puritans—Their Persecution—Rise of Separatism—Four classes of religionists in England—The Church of the Pilgrims—Its location at Scrooby and Gainsborough—Elder Brewster—Ministers of the Scrooby Church—John Robinson—Accession of James I.—The Hampton Court Conference—Persecution of Dissenters—Removal of the Scrooby Church to Holland—Difficulties attending the same—Settlement at Leyden—Employment of the Pilgrims in Holland—William Bradford—Other members of the Church. pp. 31—63.

CHAPTER III.

THE EMIGRATION TO AMERICA.

The Pilgrims resolve to leave Holland—Discussion of the question of removal—Agents sent to England for a Patent—Negotiations with the Vir-

ginia Company—A Patent obtained—Preparations to leave Holland—Compact with the Merchant Adventurers—Overtures of the Dutch—Petition of the Dutch Merchants rejected—The Speedwell and the Mayflower—Mr. Robinson's Farewell Sermon—The Pilgrims leave Leyden—Arrival in England—Departure for America—Voyage of the Mayflower—Arrival at Cape Cod—Charges against the Dutch—Cape Cod Harbor—The Compact in the Mayflower—Exploring Tours—The Landing at Plymouth—Proceedings of the Colonists—Distressing Mortality—Review of the History of the Pilgrims. pp. 64—93.

CHAPTER IV.

INTERCOURSE WITH THE INDIANS.

Visit of Samoset—League with Massasoit—Settlement of the Government of the Colony—Providence and the Pilgrims—Departure of the Mayflower—Death of Gov. Carver—William Bradford chosen Governor—Embassay to Massasoit—Trip to Nauset—Conspiracy of Corbitant—Trading Voyage to the Massachusetts—First Harvest—Thanksgiving instituted—Arrival of the Fortune—A new Patent obtained—Return of the Fortune—Distress of the Colonists—Warlike attitude of the Narragansets—A fort built at Plymouth—Second Voyage to the Massachusetts—Alarm of an Indian Conspiracy—Arrival of Weston's Shallop—Sufferings of the Pilgrims—Weston's Colony—Character of the men—Settlement at Wessagusset—Its miserable condition—Satire of Hudibras—Illness of Massasoit—An embassy sent to him—Plot against Weston's Colony—Standish sent to Wessagusset—Overthrow of Weston's Colony—Finale of Weston's Career. pp. 94—119.

CHAPTER V.

PROGRESS OF THE COLONY.

Continued Distress—A Severe Drought—Standish sent to the Eastward—Settlements in New Hampshire and Maine—Regulation of the Fisheries—Commission to West—Controversy between the King and Parliament—Arrival of the Anne and the Little James—Return of the Anne—Colony of Robert Gorges—Return of Gorges and Morrell to England—The Patent of Cape Anne—Condition of the settlement at Plymouth—Difficulties with Lyford and Oldham—Their expulsion—Dorchester Company formed—The Colony at Cape Anne—Difficulties with the Merchant Adventurers—Standish sent to England—Trading Voyage to the Eastward—Intercourse with the Dutch—De Rasieres visits Plymouth—Connection with the Merchant Adventurers dissolved—Mr. Allerton sent to England—Settlement at Mount Wollaston—Morton of Merry Mount—His Misconduct—The Settlement broken up—Morton sent to England—End of his career—Allerton revisits England—A new Patent obtained—Legislation of the Colony—Progress of Settlement—Spirit of the Pilgrims. pp. 120—148.

CHAPTER VI.

THE MASSACHUSETTS COLONY.

Character of the Colonists—Charles the First and Archbishop Laud—Persecution of the Puritans—Attention turned to America—The Cape Anne Colony—Removal of Conant to Naumkeag—Patent of the Massachusetts Colony—The Massachusetts Company—Emigration under Endicott—The Massachusetts Charter—Accessions to the Company—Emigration under Higginson—Vessels provided for the same—A Government established for the Colony—Instructions to Endicott—Claims of Oldham and Brereton—Departure of Mr. Higginson and his Company—Settlement of Charlestown—Church organized at Salem—Episcopacy expelled from the Colony. pp. 149—173.

CHAPTER VII.

TRANSFER OF THE CHARTER.

Discussion of this movement and its effects—New election of Officers—John Winthrop—His associates—New England fortunately settled—Emigration under Winthrop—Vessels for the Voyage—The Dorchester emigration—Departure of Winthrop's fleet—Arrival at Salem—Condition of the Settlements—Landing at Charlestown—Distressing Mortality—Dispersion of the Settlements—Continued Distress—A Fast appointed—Arrival of the Lyon with supplies—Conduct of the Indians—An excursion to Plymouth—Accessions to the Colony—Arrival of the Griffin—Cotton and Hooker—The Colonial Churches—The spirit of toleration. pp. 174—203.

CHAPTER VIII.

SETTLEMENT OF CONNECTICUT. THE PEQUOT WAR.

Thomas Dudley Governor—Administration of Haynes—Fresh arrival of emigrants—Henry Vane—His election as Governor—Opposition to his administration—Causes of the same—Mr. Winthrop re-elected—His death—Progress of settlement—Town organizations—Settlement of Connecticut—Difficulties with the Pequots—Expedition to Block Island—Intercession of Roger Williams—Depredations of the Indians—The Pequot War—Fort Mystic attacked—Prosecution of the War—Troops enlisted—End of the War—Renewed Hostilities—Miantonomo—His fate—The War Spirit of the past and of the present. pp. 204—234.

CHAPTER IX.

RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSIES.

Position of the Puritans—Roger Williams—His settlement at Plymouth and at Salem—Charges against him—Sentence of Banishment—Views of the Magistrates—He removes to Seekonk, and thence to Providence—His character—The career of Rhode Island—Second Controversy—Mrs. Ann Hutch-

inson—Progress of her views—Nature of the same—Charges against her—Intervention to suppress her errors—Dealings with Mr. Cotton—Mr. Wheelwright censured—Departure of Mr. Vane—A Synod convened—Its proceedings and result—Banishment of Mr. Wheelwright—Sentence of Mrs. Hutchinson—Proceedings against her adherents—Results of this controversy—Fate of Mrs. Hutchinson—Controversy with Gorton—His banishment to Rhode Island—Warrant for his arrest—He is taken prisoner—His release—General reflections. pp. 235—266.

CHAPTER X.

LEGISLATION OF THE COLONY — DIFFICULTIES WITH ENGLAND.

A Puritan Community established—Limitation of the elective franchise—Church members alone entitled to vote—Oath of Allegiance—Government of the Colony—House of Representatives established—Conflict of Political opinion—Body of Liberties—Character of the Colonial Laws—Abstract of the Body of Liberties—Morality of the people—Difficulties with England—Complaints of Gorges and Mason—The News reaches Massachusetts—Further Difficulties—A Special Commission appointed—Edward Winslow sent to England — His imprisonment — Dissolution of the Council for New England — Reasons for the same — Surrender of the Great Patent — Persecuting Policy of the King — Proceedings against the Colony — Internal enemies — The Petition to the King — The Spirit of Independence — Reflections upon the difficulties with England. pp. 267—296.

CHAPTER XI.

THE CONFEDERACY OF THE COLONIES.

Settlement of the New Haven Colony — Difficulties with the Hartford Colony—Progress of Settlement in New Hampshire—New Hampshire joined to Massachusetts—Affairs of the Plymouth Colony—Difficulties with the French—Affray with Hocking—D'Aulney and La Tour—Survey of the Condition of the Colonies—Education fostered — Harvard College — Common Schools—Projected Settlement in the Tropics—Review of the History of the Colonies—The Confederacy. pp. 297—320.

CHAPTER XII.

MASSACHUSETTS AND THE COMMONWEALTH.

The Revolution in England—Agents sent to England—Puritanism in Virginia—Action of Parliament—Vessel seized at Charlestown—Political Discussions—Seizure of a Dartmouth Ship—Difficulties within the Colony—New Dissensions—Struggle for Religious Liberty—Petition of Child and others—Mr. Winslow sent to England—Parliament favors the Colonies—Ordinance against Virginia—Cromwell's Invitation to the Puritans—Course of the Colonies—Troubles with the Dutch—Indian Difficulties—Expedition to Niantick—Spirit of the Puritans. pp. 321—348.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE PRAYING INDIANS. THE QUAKERS.

Conversion of the Indians—Labors of Roger Williams—Mayhew of Nantucket—Labors of the Mayhews—John Eliot—Civilization of the Indians—Society for Propagating the Gospel—Natick Settled—The Indian Bible and other books—Indian Churches—Labors in the Plymouth Colony—General Reflections—Difficulties with the Quakers—Rise of the Quakers—Treatment of Fox—Mary Fisher and Ann Austin—Laws against Quakers—Roger Williams and George Fox—Progress of Persecution—Apologies of the Colonists—Extravagances of the Quakers—Wenlock Christisson—Mandamus of the King—Agents sent to England—Reflections. pp. 349—372.

CHAPTER XIV.

MASSACHUSETTS AND CHARLES THE SECOND.

The Restoration—Proclamation of the King—Address to his Majesty—The Reply—Situation of the Colonies—Declaration of Rights—Proclamation of Charles in the Colonies—Agents sent to England—Their Departure—Requisitions of the King—Reluctant compliance of the Colonists—Renewed Difficulties with England—Intercessions of Sir Thomas Temple and others—Trans-Atlantic Intolerance—Commissioners appointed—They land at Boston—Nature of their Commission—Action of the General Court—Conduct of the Commissioners—Address to the King—The Commissioners return to Boston—Their Proceedings at Plymouth, Rhode Island, and Connecticut—They again return to Massachusetts—Collision with the Magistrates—Departure for New Hampshire—Their Conduct—New Demands of the King—Discussion on the same—Spirit of the people. pp. 373—403.

CHAPTER XV.

PHILIP'S WAR. 1675.

Dealings with the Indians—Difficulties with Philip—Meeting for their adjustment—Fresh Rumors circulated—Outbreak of hostilities—Swanzey attacked—Forces sent to its relief—Anticipated horrors of the War—Praying Indians enlisted—Narraganset treaty—Flight of Philip—The War in the Old Colony—Brookfield attacked—Conduct of the Western Indians—The War on the Connecticut—Attack on Hatfield—Proceedings of the Commissioners—Attack on Springfield—Fresh troops levied—Negotiations renewed—A Winter campaign proposed—March to Narraganset—Arrival at the Swamp-side—The Attack. pp. 404—428.

CHAPTER XVI.

PHILIP'S WAR. 1676.

Relative condition of the English and the Indians—The War renewed—Philip flees to the Nipmucks—Lancaster attacked—Attack on Medfield—More

troops levied—Measures for Defense—Capt Pierce ambushed at Seekonk—A Council of War convened—The Sudbury Fight—Death of Wadsworth—Sufferings of the Indians—Movements of the Connecticut troops—Attack on Scituate—Proceedings in Massachusetts—Surprise of the Indians—Death of Capt. Turner—Attack on Hadley—Philip flees to Mount Hope—Death of Philip—The War Ends—General Reflections. pp. 429—448.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE DOWNFALL OF THE CHARTER.

Commissioners to be sent to the Colonies—Death of the Fathers of New England—Fresh Difficulties with England—Petition of Gorges and Mason—Measures of Defense—Randolph sent to Massachusetts—Action of the Magistrates—Randolph visits Plymouth—He returns to England—Agents sent to England—Reception of the agents—Conduct of the King—Action of Massachusetts—Randolph appointed Collector—He again reaches Boston—Action of the Magistrates—Randolph returns to England—Letter of the King, and action upon the same—Political changes in the Colony—New agents sent to England—Conduct of Randolph—Attempt to introduce Episcopacy—Reception of the new agents in England—The War against the Charter—Discussion of the question of its surrender—Cranfield's insidious proposals—The agents return to Massachusetts—Massachusetts refuses to surrender her Charter—Speech of Increase Mather—Downfall of the Charter. pp. 449—478.

CHAPTER XVIII.

UNION OF THE COLONIES.

Accession of James the Second—Joseph Dudley appointed President—Titles to lands called in question—Exactions of Randolph and others—Maintenance of the Gospel impaired—A new Government established—Increase Mather opposes its measures—Mather sent as agent to England—Hopelessness of his mission—The Revolution in England—The news reaches Boston—Massachusetts asserts her rights—A Council of Safety appointed—Proceedings in the other colonies—Proclamation of William and Mary—Mather introduced to the Kisg—Attempt to restore the Old Charter—Andros's attempt to escape—Andros sent to England—His discharge—A new Charter sought—Parties interested in this Charter—Plymouth solicits a Charter—The Province Charter—Arrival of Phipps—Conclusion. pp. 479—518

HISTORY OF MASSACHUSETTS.

CHAPTER I.

EARLY VOYAGES. DISCOVERY OF MASSACHUSETTS.

CHAP. I. 1492.

THE discovery of America is due to the courage of Christopher Columbus. The existence of this country may have been known to the civilized world before his day, several of the Northern Nations of Europe claiming to have visited its shores so early as the eleventh century; but by him conjecture was converted into certainty. Previously, profound ignorance prevailed concerning the Western Regions of the mighty Atlantic. Its vast expanse was viewed by many with superstitious dread. No mariner had penetrated deeply into its bosom. Cautiously skirting its coasts, and feeling their way along from point to point, few had ventured to lose sight of land, and the boldest and most daring regarded its obscurity as a gulf into which conjecture could not reach, and which it was madness in any one to attempt to fathom.

The voyage of Columbus broke the charm of this spell, and the news of his discovery of a World in the West, struck Europe with an electric thrill. In every court the tidings were received with singular joy; the glowing descriptions of the productions and wealth of that World caused fancy to revel in visions of affluence; and an enthu-

CHAP. I. siasm, of which the counterpart has been seen in our own day, awakened by the discoveries in California and Australia, pervaded all classes of society, and gave a fresh impulse to maritime adventure.

The honor of initiating the discovery of America is by common consent conceded to Spain; but this honor was not long destined to be exclusively enjoyed by that nation. England was at peace with all the world; the civil wars of the rival houses of York and Lancaster had drawn to a close; the application of Bartholomew Columbus had been favorably received by Henry VII.; and a concurrence of circumstances favored the growth of the commerce of that nation, and the extension of her then but infant fame. The policy of Henry, though never signally liberal, was wise enough to encourage enterprise so far as others bore the expense; and the marts of his Kingdom were thronged with adventurers from sunnier climes, familiar with the perils of the ocean, who were ready, even upon slight encouragement, to run great risks in the hope of great gains. Among these was John Cabot, with his sons Lewis, Sancius and Sebastian, — the last of whom was a native of England, being born in Bristol, in 1477.[1]

Both father and son are said to have been skilled in the nautical sciences;[2] and the latter especially — the youthful Sebastian — whose genius is unquestionable, was filled with a daring enthusiasm and a restless desire to immortalize his name, by connecting it with some achievement akin to that which had thrown such luster upon the name of his contemporary, the Genoese voyager.[3] Communicating to

[1] Eden's Decades, fol. 255, ed. 1555, or 267, ed. 1577; Stow's Chron., 480, ed. 1631.

[2] Mr. Biddle, in his excellent Memoir of Cabot, 45, seems to doubt the skill of the father; but he was evidently familiar with maritime life, from the fact of his having already made more than one voyage.

[3] It is intimated by Whitelock, Memorials, 191, that there had been some communication between Cabot and the brother of Columbus, relative to the discoveries in the West Indies; but of this we find no proof.

the King the project of discovering a new way to India by sailing to the Northwest, this project, as promising renown if successfully executed, and as competing with the illustrious discovery of Columbus, was immediately approved; and a commission, characteristic of the thriftiness of the monarch, was issued[1] to Cabot and his sons, authorizing them to "Sail to all parts, countries, and seas of the East, of the West, and of the North, under our banners and ensigns, with five ships of what burden or quantity soever they be, and as many mariners or men as they will have with them in the said ships, *upon their own proper costs and charges*, to seek out, discover, and find whatsoever isles, countries, regions, or provinces of the heathen and infidels, whatsoever they be, and in what part of the world soever they be, which before this time have been unknown to all Christians." Power was likewise given to set up the Royal banner "in every village, town, castle, isle, or main land, by them newly found," and to subdue, occupy, and possess the same as vassals of the English Crown; and it was further stipulated in this "most ancient American state paper of England,"[2] that the patentees should be strictly bound to land at the port of Bristol on their return, and pay to the King one-fifth of the profit of their enterprise; and the exclusive privilege of resort and traffic was secured to, and vested in them and their assigns, unconditionally and unlimitedly.[3]

Mar. 5. 1495-6.

In virtue of this commission, about a year after its grant[4]

May, 1497.

[1] Rymer's Fœd., 12. 595; Hakluyt, 3. 25, 26; Hazard, 1. 9.

[2] Chalmers, Polit. Ann., 7.

[3] Biddle's Mem., 71–2; Chalmers, Ann., 7–8.

[4] Barrett, Hist. Bristol, 172, ed. 1789, says, on the authority of an ancient MS.: "In the year 1497, the 24th June, was Newfoundland found by Bristol men, in a ship called the Matthew." See also Corry's Hist. Bristol, 1. 213; Biddle's Mem., 79, note.

CHAP. I.

the youthful Sebastian, accompanying his father,[1] sailed from Bristol on his first memorable voyage across the Atlantic; and though we lack full accounts of the extent of this voyage, its result seems to have been the discovery of the American Continent, upon the Atlantic seaboard far to the North, a little more than a year before Columbus saw the main-land, and nearly two years before Vespucius sailed West of the Canaries.[2]

Feb. 3, 1497-8.

In the following year Henry, elated by success, and venturing himself to participate slightly in the enterprise, issued a second patent to *John Cabot and his deputies*, which, though less ample than the first, and worded more cautiously, allowed the grantees "VI Englisshe shippes . . . so that and if the said shippes be of the bourdeyn of CC tonnes or under, with their apparail requisite and necessarie for the safe conduct of the said shippes, and them convey and lede to the *Londe and Isles of late found by the seid John* in oure name and by oure commaundemente."[3]

The death of the father, which soon followed, virtually annulled this grant, and rendered it useless; but the young Sebastian, relying upon the implied promise of the King, without hesitation assumed the responsibility of carrying out its provisions, and "divers merchants of Bristol also adventuring small stocks," he sailed a second time, with

[1] Mr. Biddle doubts the agency of the father in this voyage; yet the terms of the patent of 1498 seem clear, and the extract from the map of Sebastian, furnished by Hakluyt, 3. 27, if authentic, corroborates his claim. Besides, Sebastian himself was too young to have had the sole charge of such an expedition — being yet a minor — and the presence of the father would seem to have been necessary, if for no other purpose than to sanction his authority, and aid him with his counsel.

[2] Smith, Gen. Hist., 1. 80, Richmond ed.; Charlevoix, 1. 4; Biddle's Mem., 95; Bancroft's U. S., 1. 10; Hildreth's U. S., 1. 34, 36.

[3] Lediard, 1. 85; Hazard, 1. 10; Biddle's Mem., 75.

others in his company, and soon beheld, with a throbbing heart, the scene of his former adventures and toils.[1]

> "Huge mountain islands of congealed ice,
> Floating like Delos on the stormy main,
> Could not deter him from his enterprise,
> Nor blood-congealing winter's freezing pain,
> Enforce him, coward-like, turn back again."[2]

Of the subsequent career of this eminent man—who gave to England her claims to that part of North America embraced in his discoveries, and who was the first to project a settlement of the country—it is hardly within our province to treat. We regret that his "Maps" and "Charts," and the journals of his voyages have probably perished, as these doubtless would serve to clear up many points in his history yet involved in obscurity, and which we can only look to the happy discoveries of some future investigator to elucidate and explain.[3]

Spain having established a Colony in the parts visited by Columbus, England prepared to imitate her example; and four years after the discovery of the continent by Cabot, a patent was granted to Richard Warde, Thomas Ashehurste, and John Thomas, merchants of Bristol, and John Fernandus, Francis Fernandus, and John Gunsolus, "borne in the isle of Surreys, under the obeysance of the Kyng of Portugale," authorizing them, *at their own expense*, to explore the "Eastern, Western, Southern, and Northern Seas," and take possession of all regions found, "hereto-

Mar. 19 1500-01.

[1] That a voyage was undertaken in 1498, seems evident, not only from the numerous references of early writers, but also from items furnished by Mr. Biddle, Mem., 85, from the Account of the King's Privy Purse Expenses, from which it appears that a ship was "prest," Mar. 22, 1498, to go "towards the new Islande." See also the notice of Cortereal's voyage, in ibid., 235–6.

[2] Fitz Geffrey's Poem on the death of Sir F. Drake, in N. E. Gen. Reg., 1. 129.

[3] See Biddle's Mem., 40. 218, for particulars respecting these documents; and comp. Lediard's Naval Hist. Eng., 1. 84.

CHAP. I.

fore unknown to Christians," in the name of England. The King's subjects, male and female, were permitted to accompany them as planters; to the patentees powers of government were granted; and they were authorized to frame laws, and enforce their execution.[1]

One voyage at least seems to have been made under this grant, when the holders, dissatisfied with its provisions,

Dec. 9. 1502.

surrendered it to the King; and late in the ensuing year a second patent was issued to Ashehurste, Gunsolus, and Francis Fernandus, with Hugh Elliott, whose name does not appear in the first;[2] but it is only from fragmentary and incidental allusions that we learn that any use was made of this patent;[3] and for more than half a century, we have accounts of but few voyages on the part of the English for discovery in the New World,[4] though the claims of the crown were still maintained.[5]

While Spain and England were thus augmenting their fame by brilliant achievements in the career of adventure, Portugal and France were provoked to follow. The Portuguese, upon the first discovery of America, claimed the

1444.

country by virtue of a bull from Eugene IV.;[6] but by a

May 4. 1493.

second and later bull, from Alexander VI.,[7] the right to the soil within certain limits was vested in Ferdinand and Isabella, and Portugal was prohibited from encroaching upon these bounds; but dissatisfied with the edict of partition, and breaking over the prohibition, private adven-

1500.

turers fitted out voyages, and Gaspar de Cortereal made discoveries at Newfoundland and Labrador.[8]

[1] Biddle's Mem., 222, 306–14.

[2] Rymer's Fœdera, 13. 37; Lediard, 1. 91; Biddle's Mem., 224.

[3] See Biddle's Mem., 226, 230, notes.

[4] For an account of these voyages, see Hakluyt, Purchas, Harris, Holmes, &c.

[5] Stat. at Large, 2 and 3 Ed. VI., chap. 6.

[6] Bozman's Maryland, 1. 14, note.

[7] Eden's Decades, 167–174, ed. 1555; Hazard, 1. 3.

[8] Paesi Novo Mondo, &c. lib. vi., c. 35; Eden's Decades, 317; Biddle's Mem., 235; Charlevoix, 1. 4; Purchas, 1. 915.

CHAP. I.

France, however, paid little attention to Papal restrictions; and that nation, prompt to seek her own aggrandizement, and envious of the fame which her neighbors were enjoying, sent vessels and prosecuted discoveries over twenty degrees of latitude on the Atlantic seaboard, of which the most prominent were made by Verrazani, and Cartier.[1] But fifty years after the discovery of America by Columbus, the only Colonies permanently planted in the New World, were those in the West Indies, and in South America. The harsher climate of the North, coupled with the perils and dangers besetting a wilderness region clad with snow nearly one-half the year, proved effectual discouragements to all who aspired to be founders of Colonies. Avarice could reap no golden harvest from the icebergs of the frigid zone. Commerce found no fragrant spices or luscious fruits to tempt the luxurious. No

1524-5. 1534-49.

> "Groves, whose rich trees wept odorous gums and balm,
> Others whose fruit burnished with golden rind,
> Hung amiable,"

adorned the coast. Only the hardier and more frugal gained a comfortable subsistence from the fisheries at the Banks.[2] Hence, while the sunny South was the theater of exciting events, the more frigid North remained, except in the fishing season, the same region of desolation and barbarism as when first visited by Cabot in 1497.

During the reigns of Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Mary, although some progress was made in navigation and commerce, little, comparatively, was done by the English to promote the discovery or settlement of America; nor was it until after the accession of Elizabeth, "The Restorer

[1] Hakluyt, 3. 250–90; Purchas, 1. 931; 4. 1605; L'Escarbot, 3–4, ed. 1612; Champlain, 1. 9–12, ed. 1632; Charlevoix, 1. 5–33. The earliest authenticated French voyage to America was made in 1504. See Charlevoix, 1. 5.

[2] For an elaborate article upon the Fisheries, see U. S. Sen. Doc., 22, for 1851–2, p. 182, et seq.

CHAP. I. of Naval Glory, and the Queen of the Northern Seas," whose vigorous mind and masculine energy were destined to exert a powerful influence upon the fortunes of her kingdom, and who ascended the throne at a period of profound domestic tranquillity and external prosperity, and in an age noted for great men and great events, that a fresh impulse was given to maritime adventure; and, under the auspices of Sir Francis Drake, the renowned circumnavigator of the globe, and Sir Humphrey Gilbert,[1] of Compton, in Devonshire,—conspicuous for his military services in France and Ireland,—with his half-brother, the gallant but unfortunate Sir Walter Raleigh, who were among the most eminent noblemen of the realm, the spirit of enterprise, which had long been slumbering in inactivity, was awakened to a new life, attended with happier results. France, too, who had never relinquished her attempts at settlement, continued her voyages, and upon the banks of the St. Lawrence, and in the region of Canada, had commenced a lucrative trade in furs; and the sails of her vessels, engaged in the fisheries, whitened the shores of Newfoundland and Labrador. But after the lapse of another half-century, and one hundred years from the discovery of Cabot, all knowledge of the interior and its geography and resources was exceedingly limited; the best charts extant were but rude sketches of the coasts and harbors; few had been bold enough to penetrate a land clothed with gloomy forests, and filled with warlike savages; and in all New England, and the country to the North towards the pole, not a white family was settled, not a white child had been born.[2]

[1] Sir Humphrey Gilbert was the author of the celebrated "Discourse to prove a passage to the Northwest" to India, published in 1576; and in 1578, he received a patent for discovering and possessing lands in America; but his voyages ended disastrously, though discoveries were made and possession was taken in customary form, of lands afterwards covered by the claims of the French. See Hakluyt, 3. 32, et seq.; Lediard, 1. 193–6.

[2] Prince, N. E. Chron., pt. 1., p. 1. ed. 1736.

Such was the aspect of affairs at the opening of the seventeenth century. By neither the English nor the French had permanent settlements been made in New England, or to the North. But the thirst for discovery was now fully enkindled; the idea of colonization was more seriously entertained; and England, having humbled Spain, vanquished her Armada, and established her supremacy as MISTRESS OF THE SEAS, was eager still farther to demonstrate her prowess by conquering the physical obstacles which had hitherto thwarted her success; and drawing out of past failures lessons of wisdom for the guidance of the future, her plans were conceived more maturely, and executed more skilfully. France, likewise, had powerful motives to prompt the continuance of her efforts. Unwilling to acknowledge her maritime inferiority to any other nation, and anxious to maintain her claims to the region over which her flag had so often floated, she was not to be outdone in voyages of discovery, or attempts at colonization. Hence the opening of the seventeenth century witnessed a succession of voyages on the part of both nations, attended with results of a more determinate character. *The first* ENGLISH *voyage resulted in the discovery of Massachusetts.*[1] CHAP. I.

One year wanting two days before Queen Elizabeth died,[2] Capt. Bartholomew Gosnold, an experienced navigator, who is said to have already crossed the Atlantic by the usual route of the Canaries and the West Indies, set out to sail to America by a Westerly course, which, as he conceived, would not only be more direct, but which would shorten the distance several hundred leagues. Furnished, principally at the cost of Henry, Earl of Southamp- 1602.

[1] The shores of Massachusetts may have been, and doubtless were, seen before this time; but the discovery of Gosnold is the first we are able to authenticate by that species of evidence which rises above mere conjecture or strong probability.

[2] Brereton, in 3 M. H. Coll., 8. 85, says: "Friday, Mar. 25;" but Archer, in ibid., 72, says the 26th.

CHAP. I.

ton — the friend and patron of Shakspeare — with a small bark, the Concord, of Dartmouth, and thirty-two men, — eight of whom were mariners, twelve planters, and twelve adventurers, — he sailed from Falmouth,[1] and steering West by the compass, after a passage of forty-nine days[2] land
May 14. was discovered, in latitude 43° 30′ North, either upon the coast of New Hampshire, or in the vicinity of the Eastern shores of Maine.[3] Standing along until noon, and anchoring near "Savage Rock," a "Basque shallop," containing eight men, visited their bark, who were at first supposed to be "Christians distressed," but who proved to be Indi-
May 15. ans, ready for trade. On the following day, in latitude 42° North, a "mighty headland" was discovered, which, from the quantity of cod-fish caught in its vicinity, was called "Cape Cod," — a name still retained, and which, says Mather, "I suppose it will never lose till shoals of cod-fish be seen swimming upon the tops of its highest hills."[4] At this place the voyagers landed, and traversed the country throughout a whole day; so that Cape Cod is entitled to the honor, not only of being the first spot upon which the first known English discoverer of Massachusetts set foot, but of being the spot where the May-flower moored, which brought over the first colony permanently planted in the State.

May 16. The next day Point Care was discovered, now known as "Sandy Point," the extreme southerly land in Barn-
May 21. stable county; on the 21st, "Martha's Vineyard," now
May 24. "No-man's-land," was seen; on the 24th, "Dover Cliff,"
May 25. now "Gay Head," was discovered; and on the 25th,

[1] Smith, Gen. Hist., p. 16, ed. 1626, says the vessel sailed from Dartmouth; but Archer, Brereton, and Strachey, say from Falmouth.

[2] The Richmond edit. of Smith's Gen. Hist., mistakes in saying land was discovered May 11; the original edition says the 14th.

[3] Strachey, in 4 M. H. Coll., 1. 224.

[4] Mather, Magnalia.

"Gosnold's Hope," now "Buzzard's Bay," and "Elizabeth Isle,"[1] now "Cutty-hunk," in the western part of which, near a pond of fresh water, two miles in circumference, Capt. Gosnold, and eleven men who promised to tarry with him, decided to make their plantation—the vessel to be returned to England by Capt. Bartholomew Gilbert.[2] CHAP. 1. May 28.

Several visits were made from this point to the adjacent islands, in the course of which many of the Indians, but few of their houses were seen; and a trip was made by Gosnold to the main-land, with whose "fair fields," "fragrant flowers," "fertile meadows," "stately groves," "pleasant brooks," and "beauteous rivers," he was highly delighted. At the mouth of one of these rivers lay "Hap's Hill," in what is now Dartmouth; and upon the banks of the other the city of New Bedford is built.[3] Nearly three weeks were spent in erecting a fort and store-house, and in lading the vessel with sassafras, the panacea of the age; but a controversy arising between the planters and their companions, and provisions falling short,[4] with the fear of other disasters, the design of a settlement was relinquished, and, leaving the island with "many true sorrowful eyes," they bore for England, and after a passage of five weeks, "came to anchor before Exmouth," having suffered none from sickness during their absence, but returning "much fatter," says one of the narrators, "and in better health than when we went out."[5] May 30, 31. Jun. 18. July 23.

[1] See 3 M. H. Coll., 8. 76.

[2] Gosnold, in his Letter to his Father, says: "As touching the place where we were most resident, it is the latitude of 41 degrees and one-third part." 3 M.H. Coll., 8. 70.

[3] In giving these localities, we follow Belknap, in his Am. Biog., and Drake, Hist. Boston, who corrects some errors in the account of the former.

[4] At their return, they "had not one cake of bread, nor any drink, but a little vinegar left." 3 M. H. Coll., 8. 71.

[5] The authorities for this Voyage are, Gosnold, Archer, and Brereton's Relations, as in Purchas, vol. 4, and in 3 M. H. Coll., 8. 69–123; Strachey, in 4 M. H. Coll., 1. 223–81, and in N. Y. Hist. Coll.; Smith's Gen. Hist., 1. 16–18; Harris, 1. 816; Lediard, 1. 382, &c. The foundation of Gosnold's storehouse is said to be yet visible. Thornton's Landing at Cape Ann, 21.

CHAP. I.

This discovery of Gosnold, and his favorable and inviting description of the country, were incentives to further enterprise; and by the persuasion of Robert Aldsworth, and Mr. Richard Hakluyt[1] — the latter the learned and efficient advocate of Western Colonization, — and with the leave of Sir Walter Raleigh, who held the patent of Virginia, within whose bounds Massachusetts lay, the mayor and aldermen, and several of the wealthiest merchants of Bristol, raised by subscription a stock of £1000, and fitted out two vessels for America: — the Speedwell, of fifty tons, with a crew of thirty men and boys, commanded by Martin Pring; and the Discoverer, of twenty-six tons, with a crew of thirteen men and boys, commanded by William Browne; — the expedition being accompanied by Robert Salterne, who had attended Gosnold the year before, and who was appointed Supercargo, or principal agent.[2]

The adventurers were equipped for a voyage of eight months, and furnished with clothing, hardware, and trinkets to trade with the natives; and with good auguries of success they sailed from Milford Haven a few days after the death of the Queen. In twenty-eight days land was discovered, in latitude 43° 30′ north, among the Fox Islands, in the mouth of the Penobscot Bay;[3] and ranging the coast to the south-west, and passing the islands of Casco Bay, the Saco, Kennebunk, York, and Piscataqua rivers, — the last of which they examined, — they sailed by Cape Ann, crossed Massachusetts Bay, and rounding Cape Cod, came to a harbor called "Whitson Bay," — now Edgarton, or Oldtown, in the Vineyard Islands, — from whence, and from the main-land in the vicinity, they commenced lading with sassafras, the principal object of their voyage.

Apr. 10. 1603.

[1] There is a tract by Hakluyt, dated 1575, advocating a plantation "in 40 and 42 degrees of latitude." See 3 M. H. Coll., 8. 104–14.

[2] Salterne's Account, as in Smith, Gen. Hist., 18, ed. 1626.

[3] Williamson's Maine, 1. 186.

In July the bark sailed for England; and in August, appearances of hostility from the Indians being discovered, Pring also left the coast, taking with him, among other curiosities, a birch canoe as a specimen of aboriginal ingenuity; and after an absence of less than six months safely arrived in King Road, near Bristol.[1] CHAP. I. Oct. 2.

Contemporary with the voyage of Gosnold, as the French had long prosecuted discoveries at the North, a fourth enterprise was projected by that nation:—a company of merchants was organized at Rouen, after the death of Chauvin, by De Chaste, Gov. of Dieppe, to develop the resources of Canada; and an expedition was fitted out under the Sieur de Pont Grave, an able navigator and a wealthy merchant of St. Malo, who, taking with him Samuel Champlain of St. Onge—a captain in the navy, who had shortly before returned from the West Indies—sailed for Tadoussac, and pushed boldly up the St. Lawrence to the Sault Saint Louis, at Montreal.[2] On his return, he found that De Chaste was dead, and that Henry IV. had granted to Pierre de Gast, Sieur de Monts—a gentleman of his bed-chamber and a Calvinist—a patent of the American Territory, embracing the discoveries of Gosnold and Pring, and extending from the fortieth to the forty-sixth degree of North latitude, appointing him lieutenant-general of the region, with power to colonize and rule it at his discretion, and to subdue and Christianize its native inhabitants; and soon after the monarch vested in De Monts the exclusive right to the commerce in peltry in Acadia and the Gulf of St. Lawrence.[3] In the following spring, De Monts, taking Champlain as his pilot, and accompanied by his friend Jean de Biencourt, 1602. 1603. Nov. 8. 1603. Mar. 7. 1604.

[1] Salterne's Relation, in Purchas, 5. 1654–6, and in Smith's Gen. Hist., 18; Harris's Voy., 1. 816; Lediard, 399. Comp. also, Belknap, Prince, Williamson, and Holmes.

[2] Champlain, Voy., 1. 38–41, ed. 1632; Charlevoix, 1. 172, ed 1744, 12mo.

[3] L'Escarbot, 432, et seq., ed. 1612; Hazard, 1. 45–8; Charlevoix, 1. 173–4. This monopoly was afterwards revoked. Champlain, 1. 45.

CHAP. I. Sieur de Poutrincourt, and a number of adventurers, both Protestant and Catholic, embarked in several vessels[1] and visited the parts embraced in his patent; and at Port Royal—now Annapolis—Poutrincourt took up his residence under a grant from De Monts, which was confirmed by the King; and the Colony established by him continued to exist until broken up by Argall in 1613.[2]

The tidings of this grant and of the accompanying voyages produced in England some sensation; and, to follow up the discovery of Gosnold, and to secure the advantages of primitive discovery and continual claim, the Earl of Southampton, his brother-in-law Lord Arundel of Wardour, and other gentlemen, despatched the Archangel, under Capt. George Weymouth, with twenty-eight men, ostensibly to discover the long-sought Northwest passage; and leaving Dartmouth the last of March, in about six weeks land was discovered near Cape Cod. Sailing thence northward fifty leagues, the vessel anchored at St. George's Island, or Monhegan; and after remaining in the country several weeks, trading with the natives, and exploring the Penobscot or the Kennebec[3]—which is described in glowing terms, and preferred to the finest streams of the Old World—Capt. Weymouth prepared for his return to England. But alas for the weakness and cupidity of man! Notwithstanding the "sole intent of the honorable setters forth of this discovery" is affirmed to have been, "not a little present private profit, but a public good, and true zeal of promulgating God's holy church, by planting Christianity," before leaving the shores five savages were seized by stratagem, and hurried into bondage—three of them being delivered to Sir Ferdinando Gorges, Governor of

Mar. 31 1605.

[1] Champlain, 1. 43, says: "Plusieurs vaisseaux;" Charlevoix, 1. 174, says four vessels; and L'Escarbot, 447, speaks of but two.

[2] Champlain, 1. 42–8; Charlevoix, 1. 179–83; Council's Relat., in 2 M. H. Coll., 9. 5.

[3] Most authorities say the former river, but some the latter.

Plymouth, in whose hands they remained three years. This treacherous act generated among the natives a hatred of the English name, and revenge and cruelties were the natural result; though in the popular language of the day it was termed "an *accident*, which must be acknowledged the means, under God, of putting on foot and giving life to all our plantations."[1] CHAP. I.

The discoveries of Gosnold, Pring, and Weymouth, the descriptions of voyagers and fishermen, the sight of the natives carried across the Atlantic, the claims of France, the conceived profits of commercial and mineral wealth, and the desire to occupy and control regions so "bountifully blessed by nature," all had their weight in exciting still farther the attention of the English, and in inspiring successful adventurers, enterprising merchants, illustrious noblemen, wealthy gentlemen, and prelates of the National Church, as well as humble artisans, with renewed ardor to prosecute voyages to America, and to plant new nations

"Wherever the bright sun of heaven shall shine."

Twenty years had passed since Raleigh's attempt to colonize Virginia, and his grant being void by reason of his attainder, and all former patents having reverted to the crown, several gentlemen, at the instance of Henry, Earl of Southampton, Sir John Popham, Lord Chief Justice of the King's Bench, Sir Ferdinando Gorges, Governor of Plymouth, and Richard Hakluyt, Prebendary of St. Augustine, petitioned King James for a grant for two plantations on the Atlantic coast. This request was promptly complied with; and, that the advantages of trade might be shared alike by the inhabitants of the East and of the West of 1606.

[1] Gorges, in 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 51. The authorities for the voyage of Weymouth, are Purchas, 4. 1659; Rosier's Relat., in 3 M. H. Coll., 8. 125–57; Strachey, in 4 M. H. Coll., 1. 228–30; Smith, Gen. Hist., 18–20; Harris, 1. 817; Lediard, 405–6.

CHAP. I. Apr. 10. 1606.

England, and the colonies established might "mutually strengthen each other," by letters patent covering and conflicting with the claims of France, all that part of the North American continent stretching from the thirty-fourth to the forty-fifth degree of North latitude, with the islands within one hundred miles of the coast, was divided into two nearly equal districts; the Southern, called the First Colony, being granted to the London Company or Council; and the Northern, called the Second Colony, to the Plymouth Company or Council. Sir Thomas Gates, Sir George Somers, Richard Hakluyt, Edward Maira Wingfield, and their associates, composed the First Colony, and were authorized to settle the Southern District—a right of property being vested in them to the lands extending along the coast fifty miles on each side of the place of their first habitation, and into the interior one hundred miles.

The Northern District was allotted to Thomas Hanham, Raleigh Gilbert, William Parker, George Popham, and their associates, knights, gentlemen and merchants, of Exeter, Plymouth, and other towns of the West of England, with similar privileges, and a like grant of territorial sovereignty and domain. The First Company—by far the most opulent—was permitted to begin its plantation at any place below the forty-first degree of North latitude; and the Second Company—which was much the poorer of the two—anywhere above the thirty-eighth degree;—and the intermediate space was left open to both, though to prevent interference, it was stipulated that the Colony last planted should not begin a settlement within one hundred miles of that first planted.

The Government of these Colonies was vested, First, in a Council of thirteen, resident in England, approved by and removeable at the pleasure of the King, who were to have paramount jurisdiction according to laws given under his sign-manual; and Second, in two subordinate

Councils, each of thirteen members, resident in America, and nominated by the King, who were to rule and manage the internal affairs of each Colony agreeably to his instructions. The charter conceded to all the colonists the rights of citizens of the realm, and the privilege of holding their lands by the freest and least burdensome tenure; all things necessary for their subsistence and commerce were to be free of duty for seven years; and all duties levied on foreign commodities for twenty-one years were to constitute a fund for their particular benefit. Authority was also given to coin money, and expel intruders as occasion required.[1] CHAP. I. 1606.

We have given at length an abstract of this charter, because of its bearings upon the history of New England. That it was liberal for the age, may possibly be true; yet its provisions were the product of but a limited experience, and the instrument itself contained exceptionable features, for by it, "the most ancient colonists were placed under the regimen of a three-fold jurisdiction; they were subject equally to the personal power of their sovereign, to the distant regulations of a commercial company, and to the immediate government of a president and council, without tasting the pleasures of suffrage, or enjoying the importance of self-legislation."[2]

Under all the circumstances, however, the charter was as good as could have been reasonably expected. The enterprise was a new one. England had but just entered upon her career of deducing colonies abroad. The few abortive efforts of the past had done little to enlighten her judgment. And it needed that she should be taught by the results of her future movements the defectiveness of her policy, and wherein it needed amendment for her own good, and the good of her several dependencies. These

[1] The patent is in Hazard, 1. 50–8.

[2] Chalmers, Revolt, 1. 6, and Annals, 14.

CHAP. I. lessons were slowly learned; all favors were grudgingly conceded; and the conflict of interests was at last so intolerable, that not only were the colonists compelled to overstep the boundaries of their charters, but the monarch was compelled to wink at such irregularities, or run the risk of alienating his subjects, and destroying the settlements.

Dec. 19. 1606. Eight months from the issue of this patent, and one hundred and nine years after the discovery of the continent by Cabot, a small squadron of three ships—the largest not exceeding one hundred tons burthen—was sent by the London Company, under Capt. Newport, a distinguished naval officer, with one hundred and five colonists, including the members of a Colonial Council, to the coast of South Virginia; and in the following spring, after many obstacles encountered, and amidst jealousies and dissensions, a settlement was effected upon the peninsula of Jamestown, of which but the ruins at present remain.[1]

April. 1607.

May 31. 1607. Nearly at the same time a similar enterprise was projected by the Plymouth Company, under more discouraging circumstances, owing to its poverty, and two ships—the "Gift of God," and the "Mary and John"[2]—with a few over a hundred landsmen, were despatched under Raleigh Gilbert, a nephew of Sir Walter Raleigh, and George Popham, the brother of the Chief Justice; but the result was the unfortunate colony at Sagadahoc.[3] The fate of this attempt, with the doleful reports of the inhospitableness of the climate circulated by the emigrants to cover their cowardice, checked for a season the ardor of the company; though Sir Ferdinando Gorges, and Sir Francis Popham,

[1] Smith, Gen. Hist., 41–2; Lediard, 412–15; Bancroft, 1. 123–4.

[2] Gorges, in 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 54, says three ships; but the Council's Relation, in 2 M. H. Coll., 9. 3, says two ships.

[3] See Gorges' Narr., and the Council's Relation, just quoted; Smith, Gen. Hist., 203; Strachey's Narrative; Hubbard, 36–7; Lediard, 410–11.

the son of the Chief Justice—the former of whom was never dismayed—continued sending vessels to the coast, and spent large sums in efforts at colonization.[1] CHAP. I.

Meanwhile under the auspices of the Dutch—a nation whose independence had been substantially recognized by England and France, and which was rapidly rising into commercial importance—discoveries were made by Henry Hudson[2]—an Englishman by birth—in the yacht "Half-Moon," upon the beautiful river which bears his name; and by Hendrick Christiaensen, Adrian Block, and others, at the charge of prominent merchants of Amsterdam, who derived great profits from the furs brought home by the vessels in their employ. A trading house was erected near Albany, called "Fort Nassau;" explorations were vigorously prosecuted around "Manhattan" by Block, in the "Restless;" and the discovery of the island which bears his name, and the three famous rivers, the Housatonic, the Thames, and the Connecticut, with Long Island, and Rhode Island, are said to have been the fruits of his energetic enterprise. Even the shores of Massachusetts as far as Nahant were visited by this navigator, and names were given to places discovered by Gosnold and others; and after his return to Holland, the States General, who had unsuccessfully attempted to effect a junction with England for the colonization of Virginia, passed an ordinance for the encouragement of commerce, under which a company was organized, licensed for three years, and empowered "exclusively to visit and navigate to the aforesaid newly discovered lands lying in America, between New France and Virginia, the sea-coasts whereof extend from the fortieth to the forty-fifth degree of latitude, now named New Netherland."[3]

1609.

1610-14.

1614.

Oct. 11. 1614.

[1] Gorges, in 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 56, 57; Council's Relation, in 2 M. H. Coll., 9. 4, 5; Smith, 204.

[2] Hudson had previously made voyages under the sanction of merchants of London. Purchas, 3. 464; Harris, 1. 564; Lediard, 419; Brodhead's N. York, 24.

[3] Heylin's Cosmog., 1028, ed. 1670; Brodhead's N. Y., 24–63; Bancroft's U. S., 2. 265–77; Hildreth's U. S., 1. 136–9.

CHAP. I.

It is worthy of notice that this ordinance neither incorporated nor conferred powers of government upon the merchants of Holland, but vested in them simply a monopoly of trade; the charter expired in 1618; the West India Company was not incorporated until 1621 — a year after the settlement of Plymouth; — the territory of New Netherland was not formally erected into a Province until 1623; nor was any permanent agricultural colony established within its limits until that year. It should also be noticed, that the territory embraced in the charter of 1614 was claimed by England, and was included in the patent to the Virginia Company; the settlements of the Dutch were ever regarded as intrusions; the controversies growing out of these claims disturbed for a long time the peace of the colonies; nor were they permanently adjusted until after the reduction of New Netherland in 1664.

1614. A new era in the annals of New England begins with the voyages of Capt. John Smith. This remarkable man, a native of Willoughby, in Lincolnshire, although but thirty-five years of age, had acquired a world-wide reputation by his extraordinary adventures, begun in boyhood and continued for the space of "near twice nine years." He had been a traveller in Europe, Asia, and Africa; a soldier in Austria, battling with the Turks, and knighted for his services by Sigismund Bathori; a slave at Constantinople, and indebted for his deliverance to "the lady Tragabigzanda;" and, crossing to the New World to acquire new laurels, he had been a voyager to South Virginia, and President of the Colonial Council of that Plantation.[1]

Furnished, principally at the charge of four private gentlemen,[2] with an outfit of two vessels, and a company

[1] See his own account, in his Gen. Hist., vol. 1., Richmond edition.

[2] Chalmers, Ann., 80, errs in attributing the outfit of this voyage to the Plymouth Company. It was a *private* adventure, of members of that company and others. See 2 M. H. Coll., 9. 5, 6, and Smith, Gen. Hist., and his Pathway, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 19.

of forty-nine men and boys — sixteen of whom were for colonists — he sailed from London early in March, and in a few weeks arrived at Monhegan, where he immediately entered upon the chief business of his voyage: "to take whales, and make trials of a mine of gold and copper." "If those failed," says he, "fish and furs were then our refuge, to make ourselves savers." CHAP. I. Mar. 3. 1614. April.

But "whale fishing" proved a "costly conclusion;" the "gold mine" was a chimera of the brain of "the master;" and fish and furs became the last resort. "Of dry fish," says he, "we made about 40,000, of corfish about 7000;[1] and "whilst the sailors fished," Capt. Smith and a few others ranged the coast in an open boat, in the most attractive season of the year, making noted discoveries, and purchasing, "for trifles, near 1100 beaver skins,[2] 100 martens, and near as many otters"—valued in all at £1500. "With these furs, the train and corfish," he returned to England, July 18. and within six months "arrived safe back" — the other ship remaining for a season to "fit herself for Spain with the dry fish."

In this remarkable voyage, the coast was explored "from Penobscot to Cape Cod," within which bounds, he says, "I have seen at least 40 several habitations upon the sea coast, and sounded about 25 excellent good harbors, in many whereof there is anchorage for 500 sails of ships of any burthen, in some of them for 5000;[3] and more than 200[4] isles overgrown with good timber of divers sorts of woods." Of the coast of Massachusetts he says, it is "indifferently mixed with high clay or sandy cliffs in one place, and then tracts of large long ledges of divers sorts, and quarries of stone;"

[1] In his "Pathway," 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 20, he says 60,000; but in his Gen. Hist., and his Descrip. of N. E., he says 40,000.

[2] It is 11,000 in the Gen. Hist., and 1100 in the other works.

[3] It is 5,000 in the Descrip. of N. E., but 1,000 in his other works,

[4] It is 200 in the Gen. Hist., and the Descrip. of N. E., and 300 in the "Pathway."

CHAP. I. and "by reason of those sandy cliffs, and cliffs of rocks," he adds, "both which we saw so planted with gardens and cornfields, and so well inhabited with a goodly, strong and well proportioned people, besides the greatness of the timber growing on them, the greatness of the fish, and the moderate temper of the air, ... who can but approve this a most excellent place, both for health and fertility? And of all the four parts of the world that I have yet seen, not inhabited, could I but have means to transport a colony, I would rather live here than anywhere. And if it did not maintain itself, were we but once indifferently well fitted, let us starve."

Indeed, the Massachusetts country, to him, was "the paradise of all those parts, for here are many isles all planted with corn, groves, mulberries, salvage gardens, and good harbors," and "the seacoast, as you pass, shows you cornfields, and great troupes of well proportioned people."[1] There is no evidence of his having advanced in this voyage up into the Bay to "Mishawum," or Charlestown, as is represented in the Records of that Town;[2] but he seems to have crossed from Cape Ann to Cohasset, and describes the Bay, not from personal inspection, but from the representations of the Indians.

But though Smith acted honorably as principal of this expedition, his companion Hunt, whom he left behind, vilely copied the example of Weymouth, and enticing to his vessel upwards of twenty[3] of the natives under pretense of trade, he confined them in the hold, and sailed for Malaga, where part of them, at least, were sold as slaves. "This barbarous act," says Mather, "was the unhappy occasion of

[1] The authorities for this voyage, are his Descrip. of N. E., pub. in 1616, and repub. in 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 95–140; his Pathway, pub. in 1631, and repub. in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 1–54; and his Gen. Hist., ed. 1626, 204–8. At his return he issued a map of the country, which then first received, from Prince Charles, the name of New England.

[2] See Chas'n. Recs., in Young's Chron. Pil.

[3] Some authorities say 24, others 27.

the loss of many a man's estate and life, which the barbarians did from thence seek to destroy; and the English, in consequence of this treachery, were constrained for a time to suspend their trade, and abandon their project of a settlement in New England."[1] CHAP. I.

The prosperous pecuniary issue of the first voyage of Smith, awakened in his mind an earnest desire to visit again the delightful regions which his pen has described; and imparting his views to Sir Ferdinando Gorges, a man of kindred enthusiasm, and to Dr. Sutcliffe, Dean of Exeter,[2] he was, after some delay, furnished with two ships — one of two hundred, and the other of fifty tons burthen — with which he set out on his second voyage; but as if an inexorable fate relentlessly pursued the persevering Gorges, the largest ship was disabled ere Smith had sailed two hundred leagues,[3] and he was forced to return. The smaller vessel, commanded by Capt. Thomas Dermer, continued on her course, and after a successful voyage of five months returned in safety. Obtaining another bark of sixty tons in the place of his disabled ship, and taking with him thirty men — sixteen planters and fourteen mariners[4] — the dauntless Smith, gathering fresh courage from the consciousness of difficulties, renewed his attempt; but misfortune followed misfortune, until it seemed as if everything was arrayed to defeat his plans. He was first attacked by brutal pirates; then taken prisoner by four French man-of-war, stripped of everything, and detained March. 1615. Jun. 24. 1615.

[1] Mather, Magnalia, vol. 1; Council's Relat., in 2 M. H. Coll., 9. 6; Hubbard, 38–9

[2] The Council's Relation, in 2 M. H. Coll., 9. 7, seems to speak as if Smith and Dermer were sent out by the Plymouth Co.; but Smith, Descrip. N. E., 49, and Gen. Hist., 221, makes the statement in the text.

[3] The Gen. Hist., 2. 207, Richmond ed., says: "ere I had sailed 120 leagues." But in his "Pathway," 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 20, he says he was "more than 200 leagues at sea" when he returned.

[4] The names of the planters are in the Gen. Hist., p. 222, ed. 1626, or vol. 2. 206, Richmond ed.; and Descrip. N. E., p. 45, ed. 1616, or in 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 130.

CHAP. I. three months, when he succeeded in escaping "far beyond all men's reason or his expectation."[1]

Forced by these reverses, and by the discouragement of his employers, to relinquish for a time his plans of colonization, the restless spirit of this resolute man could not be content to remain inactive; and publishing to the world
1616. his "Description of New England," he traversed the kingdom to awaken an interest in establishing permanent settle-
1617. ments in these parts. "I spent that summer," he says, "in visiting the Cities and Townes of Bristoll, Exeter, Bastable, Bodnam, Perin, Foy, Milborow, Saltash, Dartmouth, Absom, Tattnesse, and the most of the Gentry in Cornewall and Deuonshire, giving them Bookes and Maps, shewing how in six moneths the most of those ships had made their voyages, and with what good successe;" but the only result of his earnest labors was a promise that "twenty saile of ships" should be furnished him the next year; and "in regard of my paines, charge, and former losses, the westerne Commissioners in behalf of themselues and the rest of the Company, and them hereafter that should be ioyned to them, contracted with me by articles indented vnder our hands, to be Admirall of that country during my life, and in the renewing of their Letters-Patent so to be nominated."[2]

1614 to 1616. Contemporary events, however, unlooked for by the Plymouth Council, were preparing New England for successful colonization. First of all a war broke out among the aborigines, which resulted in the destruction of thousands of the Indians, with the "Great Bashaba" at their

[1] Gen. Hist., 2. 207–13, Richmond ed.; Pathway, in 3. M. H. Coll., 3. 21; Descrip. N. E., p. 51, ed. 1616, or in Force, vol. 2, and 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 133–8; Council's Relat., in 2 M. H. Coll., 9. 7. Some authorities represent this second voyage as undertaken in 1616.

[2] Gen. Hist., 2. 218, Richmond ed.; Pathway, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 24. Prince and Holmes quote Purchas as authority for a voyage undertaken by Smith in 1617; but I find no notice of such a voyage in Smith's own writings.

head;[1] and to war succeeded pestilence, which completed the work of depopulation. This singular disease, "the greatest that ever the memory of father to son took notice of," spread far and wide, and was exceedingly fatal. It raged, at intervals, for more than two years, and extended, in its wasting effects, from the borders of the Tarratines southward to the Narragansets. The people "died in heaps, insomuch that the living were in no wise able to bury the dead;" the wigwams were filled with putrefying corpses; "young men and children, the very seeds of increase," and whole families and tribes perished; and even seven years after, the bones of the unburied lay bleaching upon the ground at and around their former habitations. CHAP. I 1617 to 1619.

The nature of this epidemic has never been determined. It has been called the "small pox," and the "yellow fever." But whatever was its character, all were not equally affected by its ravages, for the Penobscots and the Narragansets suffered but little. Nor does it seem to have troubled the few English residents of the country. Richard Vines, the agent of Gorges, who was stopping at Saco when the pestilence was at its height says, that, though he and his men "lay in the cabins with these people that died, some more, some less, not one of them ever felt their heads to ache so long as they stayed there."[2]

Providence, too, whose prerogative it is, was bringing good out of evil. The natives, who had been treacherously carried to England, were some of them yet living there, and had acquired a smattering of the English tongue; Gorges, who had received and entertained them kindly,

[1] Gorges, in 3. M. H. Coll., 6. 57.

[2] Smith's Pathway, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 16; Gorges, in 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 57; Morton's Mem., 23; T. Morton's N.Eng. Can., in Force, vol. 2; Higginson, in Chron. Mass. 256; Johnson, in 2 M.H. Coll., 2. 66; Gookin, in 1 M. H. Coll., 1. 148; Cotton's Way of Cong. Churches, 21, and Reply to Williams, 27–8; Hubbard, 54–5, 194–5; Plym. Col. Laws, ed. 1671; the Charter of King James, of 1620, &c. &c.

CHAP. I. had often conversed with them of America and its inhabitants; and still anxious to accomplish his favorite project of settling a colony on these shores, he was on the eve of fitting out a new expedition, and the captive aborigines were to accompany its commander.

1618. Learning that Capt. Dermer, the companion of Smith in the voyage of 1615, was then at Newfoundland, where a colony had been established a few years before,[1] and that he was an active friend of discovery and settlement, through the persuasion of Gorges Capt. Edward Rocroft was sent to those parts in a vessel of two hundred tons, with orders to join Dermer in exploring the coasts of New England. On reaching the coast, and whilst awaiting the arrival of his companion — who was then absent — Rocroft seized a French bark of Dieppe, engaged in fishing, and finding her a valuable prize, he sent her master and crew in his own ship to England, and keeping possession of the captured vessel, his men conspired to rob and slay him; but

Dec. 1618. putting the mutineers ashore at "Sawaguatock," he sailed to Virginia, where he had lived some years before, and in another quarrel he was killed, and his bark was sunk during a storm.[2]

Dermer, in the meantime, had crossed over to England; and after conferring with Gorges, he set out on his return in a ship belonging to his employer, expecting to meet Rocroft according to appointment; but finding he had left, and learning his fate by a ship from Virginia, he sent his own vessel to England, laden with fish and furs, and em-

May 26. 1619. barked in an open pinnace of five tons, taking with him Tisquantum or Squanto — the subsequent friend and inter-

[1] For a sketch of this colony, see Whitbourne's Newfoundland, ed. 1620. A copy of this rare work is in the valuable library of Charles Deane, Esq., of Cambridge.

[2] Gorges, in 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 61–2; Council's Relat., in 2 M. H. Coll., 9. 7–10.

peter of the Pilgrims — and "searching every harbor, and compassing every cape-land," he arrived at length in the neighborhood of what is now Plymouth, and "travelling along a day's journey to a place called Nummastaquyt" — now Middleboro' — "my savage's native country," a messenger was despatched "a days journey further to Pockanokit, which bordereth on the sea; whence came to see me two kings, attended with a guard of fifty armed men, who being well satisfied with that my savage and I discoursed unto them, being desirous of novelty, gave me content in whatsoever I demanded. Here I redeemed a Frenchman, and afterwards another at Masstachusit, who three years since escaped shipwreck at the Northeast of Cape Cod."[1] May. 1619.

From this place the voyager, passing the Dutch settlement at Manhattan, continued on to Virginia, where he tarried for the remainder of that year; and returning to the northward the ensuing spring for the prosecution of his discoveries, in the vicinity of Cape Cod he was beset by the natives, and received a large number of wounds of which he subsequently died.[2] 1620.

This journey of 1619, as preceding by a year the settlement of Plymouth, and as taken in the territory so often alluded to by the Pilgrims, is exceedingly interesting. It was an important addition to the knowledge of the country, and prepared the way, by its friendly termination, for the hospitable reception of the Plymouth colonists by the generous Massasoit and his brother Quadequina, whom all will recognize as the two savage kings alluded to in the narrative.

Eighteen years had now elapsed since the discovery of Massachusetts by the enterprising Gosnold, and as yet no 1620.

[1] Purchas, 4. 1778; Smith, Gen. Hist., 2. 219; Council's Relat., in 2 M. H. Coll., 9. 10, 11; Gorges, in 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 62-3; Hubbard, 40, 54; Morton's Mem., 25-7.

[2] Council's Relat., in 2 M. H. Coll., 9. 12, 13; Dermer, in Purchas, 4. 1778-9, and in N. Y. Hist., Coll., 1. 352; Brodhead's N. Y., 92-4.

CHAP. I. 1620.

colony was planted upon its territory. The settlements to the North were more successful, and in Canada and Newfoundland colonies were established, and children had been born.[1] To the South, also, the Dutch had thrown up slight bulwarks at New Netherlands, and were conducting a lucrative trade in furs.[2] But the indefatigable Gorges was not easily baffled; and after he had "made so many trials of the state and commodities of the country, and nature and condition of the people, and found all things agreeable to the ends" which he proposed, he "thought it sorted with reason and justice to use the like diligence, order and care" for the affairs of the Northern Plantation, as the London Council had employed for the Southern; and of "this his resolution, he was bold to offer the sounder considerations to divers of his Majesty's Honorable Privy Council, who had so good liking thereunto, as they willingly became interested themselves therein as patentees and counsellors for the management of the business," and application was made to the king for a charter. His Majesty, who was at this time highly offended with the members of the London Council for their bold defiance of his arbitrary will, listened not unwillingly to the propositions of his "trusty and well-beloved servants," and readily sanctioned their request for a patent. But to obtain this instrument was no easy matter, for not only was the London Council earnest in its remonstrances, but the French protested against it, and there were many members of Parliament opposed to all commercial monopolies, so that two years elapsed before a patent could be obtained.

July 23. 1620.

At length an order was issued to Sir Thomas Coventry, Solicitor General, to "prepare a Patent ready for his Majesty's Royal Signature;" and a few months later the GREAT

[1] Prince's Chronol., and Whitbourne's Newfoundland, ed. 1620.

[2] Brodhead's New York, ch. 3.

PATENT FOR NEW ENGLAND passed the seals.[1] In this memorable document, the principal foundation of all subsequent grants of territory in New England, his Majesty conveyed to forty of his subjects[2] — among whom were the most powerful and wealthy of his nobility — all that part of America extending from the 40th to the 48th degree of North latitude, and between these parallels from the Atlantic to the Pacific: — a body of land embracing the Acadia of the French, and the New Netherlands of the Dutch, and covering nearly the whole of the present inhabited British Possessions in North America, all New England, the State of New York, half of New Jersey, nearly all of Pennsylvania, and the vast country to the West — comprising, and at the time believed to comprise, more than a million of square miles, and capable of sustaining more than two hundred million of inhabitants.[3]

Nov. 3. 1620.

The Company established by this grant — which was to consist of "forty persons and no more" — was to be known as "the Council established at Plymouth, in the county of Devon, for the Planting, Ruling, Ordering, and Governing New England in America." Absolute property in the soil, unlimited jurisdiction, the regulation of trade, sole powers of legislation, the administration of justice, and the appointment of all officers, were among the privileges conceded by his Majesty. Subordinate patents, vesting property in the soil, could be granted by this Council, but it could not confer powers of government without the authority and

[1] Gorges, in 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 64–5; Council's Relat., in 2 M. H. Coll., 9. 11-12. The Patent is in the volume of the Plym. Col. Laws, pub. in 1836, and in Hazard, Baylies, and Trumbull.

[2] Their names are in the instrument, and may be seen as above.

[3] Smith, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 31; Baylies' Mem. Plym. Col., 1. 185; Bancroft's U. S., 1. 272; Everett's Orations, 208. — Douglas, 1. 366, says this patent "was designedly extended much North and South, to include and keep up the English claims to New Netherlands in possession of the Dutch, to the Southward, and to L'Acadia, since called Nova Scotia, then in possession of the French, to the Northward."

CHAP. I. consent of the king.[1] In other respects its powers were complete. The lands and islands, the rivers and harbors, the mines and fisheries were all under its control. None, without leave, could buy a skin, catch a fish, or build a hut. It was a commercial monopoly, exclusive and despotic: — a corporation potent for evil or for good.[2]

At the very moment this charter was granted, as if to prove that without its aid more could be accomplished than under its sanction, a solitary bark — the forlorn Mayflower — was wending its way wearily across the Atlantic, bearing in its bosom a resolute band of one hundred men, women and children, who were, under God, to become the founders of a wide-spread republic, and to plant the seeds of a thriving nation, whose destiny, yet unfolding, futurity alone can fully reveal.

[1] This fact is worthy of notice, and should ever be borne in mind in investigating the history of New England. We are aware it has been asserted that the Council could confer by grant powers similar to its own; but this was denied by the Crown Lawyers, and must therefore be considered as doubtful. See Belknap's N. H., 1. App. xv, and the authorites quoted in Chap. 6 of this work.

[2] For the views of the Council, see 2 M. H. Coll., 9. 13.

CHAPTER II.

THE REFORMATION. THE PILGRIMS.

To appreciate the circumstances which led to the settlement of Plymouth in 1620, and to the establishment of the Massachusetts Colony a few years later, it is necessary to be acquainted with the history of religion, especially in England, during the preceding hundred years.

At the opening of the sixteenth century all Christian Europe, with but slight exceptions, was under the dominion of the Church of Rome. The Pope was the recognized head of that Church, and the fountain of all power, both temporal and spiritual. Kings reigned by his decree; subjects bowed to his behests. The keys of heaven and hell were in his hands. He was the vicegerent of Christ; omnipotent in his sphere; impeccable — infallible — a God upon earth.

The Supremacy of the Pope few dared question. Attempts had been made to renounce his dominion, but the offenders were speedily reduced to submission, or atoned for their contumacy by the loss of their lives. It was more than high treason to deny his authority; — it was heresy — blasphemy — an unpardonable sin. Hence his sway was undisputed. The world was his footstool, and all were his subjects.

England herself was Catholic at this time. For many hundred years that nation, like her neighbors, had been the vassal of Rome. The net-work of the Church spread all over the kingdom, and the yoke of her superstitition seemed

CHAP. II.

riveted firmly upon the necks of the people. The government, indeed, had successfully resisted a few of her encroachments; and individual minds had emancipated themselves from her thraldom, and denounced her as "Babylon," "the Mother of Harlots." Yet when Luther kindled the fires of the Reformation, Henry VIII., the reigning monarch, was a dutiful and obedient child of the Church; and no sooner did he hear of the apostasy of the Saxon monk, than he zealously denounced him as the chief of heretics, wrote in defense of the Seven Sacraments, and was rewarded for his championship with the flattering title of "Defender of the Faith."[1]

1517. to 1538.

In twenty years from the day on which Luther burned the bull of Leo before the gates of Wittenberg, his views had spread with electric speed; the Augsburg Confession had been published; Protestantism had assumed its distinctive position; and in Saxony and most of the German principalities, in Sweden and Denmark, Hungary and Bohemia, Poland and the Netherlands, France and Spain, and in Switzerland and England, the reformation had secretly or openly gained foothold, and the assumptions of Rome had been publicly spurned.[2] Erasmus had leveled the shafts of his wit against the flagrant abuses of the Church, the corruptions of her priesthood, and the brutishness of the monastic orders; Calvin, Melancthon, Zuingle, Petri, Bucer, Œcolampadius, Peter Martyr, and Bullinger, early and warmly enlisted in the cause of reform; and a host of determined and indomitable opponents of the supreme and unlimited authority of the Pope sprung into existence, hurling back the thunders fulminated from the Vatican, tram-

[1] Burnet, 1. 51, 282; 3. 26–7, 258; Echard, 640; Parl. Hist. Eng., 3. 26; Neal, 1. 31; Whitelock's Mem., 203, ed. 1709. This title was confirmed by the vote of a full consistory at Rome, and ratified by the signatures of twenty-seven Cardinals; and the Bull is in Herbert' Henry VIII., 95–8.

[2] Mosheim, Eccl. Hist., XVI. cent., Sect., 1. c. 2.

pling upon decretals, the engines of its vengeance, and exposing the corruption, the profligacy, and the disgusting debaucheries which disgraced its dominion. CHAP. II.

Even Henry himself had experienced a change in this time; originating, not from his conviction of the falsity of Romanism, or from his sympathy with the reformation, but from the refusal of Clement VII. to decree his divorce from Catherine of Arragon, and sanction his marriage with Anne Boleyn.[1] Inflamed by his passions more than influenced by reason, the monarch renounced his allegiance to the Roman See, abrogated the authority of the Pope in his realm, assumed the title of "Supreme Head of the Church of England," and compelled his subjects to acknowledge him substantially as Pope in his own dominions.[2] 1530. Jan. 20. 1534-5.

Previously, the doctrines of Luther had gained admittance into the kingdom, and though repudiated by the king and by the majority of the clergy, they had been received by the thoughtful with marked approbation; speeches pregnant with Protestant principles had been delivered in the House of Commons; and a reformation of religion, consistently with the laws of the land, had been publicly resolved upon.[3] Hence the king, in asserting the Trans-Alpine in opposition to the Cis-Alpine Supremacy, found a portion of the people measurably prepared for the step, and a few in the higher walks — as Cranmer, Cromwell, Shaxton and Latimer — favored the change.[4]

But whatever may have been the views of the thoughtful or the desires of the wise, or however readily Henry may

[1] For a full history of this affair, see Burnet, vols. 1 and 3; Herbert's Henry VIII., 243, et seq.; Acta Regia, 3. 244, et seq.; and Parl. Hist. Eng., vol. 3. Comp. also Stow's Chron., ed. 1631. pp. 540–546, 560; Whitelock, Memo., 205, et seq.

[2] Pulton's Statutes at Large, 26 Henry VIII., c. 1; Burnet, 1. 234–7; Parl. Hist. Eng., 3. 109–13; Herbert's Henry VIII., 408; Stow, 571; Echard, 680–3; Neal, 1. 34; Whitelock, 213.

[3] Herbert's Henry VIII., 148, 320–4; Parl. Hist. Eng., 3. 56–65.

[4] Burnet, 1. 344–51.

CHAP. II.

have himself countenanced their schemes out of favor to the new Queen, or to subserve his own ends, on the part of the monarch it may be unhesitatingly affirmed that this renunciation of the power of Rome and assertion of his own supremacy, was instigated by no wish to introduce a purer and more simple worship, nor does he appear ever to have been personally in favor of that phase of Protestantism which not only denied the authority of the Pope, but denounced also the forms and many of the dogmas of Catholicism.[1] His was simply a daring yet successful attempt to vest in himself the insignia of Rome: — to transfer the Tiara from the Tiber to the Thames. This was all he desired: — this was all he would permit.

The Act of Supremacy contained no clause favorable to religious liberty; the suppression of monasteries and the sequestration of their revenues served chiefly to replenish the exhausted treasury of an extravagant prince, or to gratify the avarice and rapacity of his courtiers; — the church after all remained essentially Popish.[2] Indeed, so far was the king from tolerating inquiry, or sincerely favoring the views of the reformers, that, after the death of Anne, and the Lady Jane who succeeded her, — both of
1539. whom were friendly to the reformation, — an Act for "abolishing diversity of opinion," known as "the Bloody Statute," or "the Lash with Six Strings," was passed, which asserted most of the objectionable doctrines of the Romish church,

[1] The language of the Stat. 25 H. VIII., c. 21., is significant, and shows what the views of the king were at this time. "Provided alwaies," says that instrument, "that this act nor any thing or things therein contained, shall be hereafter interpreted or expounded, that your Grace, your Nobles, and Subjects, intend by the same to decline, or varie from the congregation of Christ's Church, in any thinge, concerning the verie articles of the Catholike faith of Christendom," &c.

[2] Stat. at Large, 27 H. VIII., c. 27, 28, and 31 H. VIII., c. 13; Burnet, 1. 313, 430; Parl. Hist. Eng., 3. 115–18; Neal, 1. 35; Hallam, 50–4; Herbert's Henry VIII., 397. The latter says of the king: "He separated himself from the *Obedience* of the Roman Church, but not from the *Religion* thereof."

1834328

the denial of which subjected the offender to the penalty of death, and to the forfeiture of his lands and goods as a felon;[1] and although in his genial mood the Scriptures had been translated into English, — the vernacular of the realm, — the reading of the same — which had been permitted for a season, but which was protested against by the bishops — now that Cromwell had fallen and his influence was withdrawn, was prohibited to all under the rank of a gentleman; the king's form of "Orthodox doctrine" was set forth as a standard of belief; and all teaching contrary to his instructions were to recant for the first offense; abjure for the second and bear a fagot; and for a further relapse they were to be adjudged as heretics, forfeit their goods, and be burned at the stake.[2] CHAP. II. 1543.

Such was the position of affairs at the close of this reign. Conscience was not enfranchised; liberty was not allowed; the supremacy of the Anglican Church alone was maintained. The king, by his power, could burn as heretics the favorers of Protestantism, and hang as traitors the supporters of the Pope. Had Calvin or Luther been Englishmen they might have perished by fire.[3] The minds of men as well as the forms of worship were controlled by the crown. The people could proceed no further than the king authorized. Suspending their own judgment, they were to follow their monarch, licentious as he was; to bow at his beck, and subscribe to his creed. None might utter a whisper of opposition to his capricious proceedings. As tenacious of his reputation for Catholic Orthodoxy as of his claims to spiritual dominion, he cared little for progress in

[1] Stat. at Large, 31 H. VIII., c. 14; Burnet, 1. 412–17; Herbert's Henry VIII., 510; Parl. Hist. Eng., 3. 140, 147–150; Neal, 1. 39; Whitelock, 217. Cranmer at first opposed this Act, and Shaxton and Latimer refused to conform to it; but it continued in force, nor was it repealed until after the accession of Edward VI. Strype, Mem., 1. 352; Kennet, 2. 219; Burnet, 1. 428.

[2] Stat. at Large, 34 H. VIII., c. 1; Burnet, 1. 434, 441, 486, 516–18.

[3] Turner's England, 3. 140; Whitelock's Memo., 218; Macauly, 1. 46.

CHAP. II.

religious affairs, and cared only to maintain his own absolute power. Hence he never departed widely from the creed of his childhood, and died in the Romish rather than in the Protestant communion.[1] Yet something had been gained: — the power of the Pontiff was broken, and an impulse was given to the spirit of inquiry which the monarch and the clergy strove in vain to resist.[2] But there was a Pope now in England as well as in Italy, and there was a Catholic Church in the British dominions as well as at Rome.

1547. Upon the accession of Edward VI., the son of Henry and the Lady Jane Seymour, who had been educated by Protestants, and who was distinguished for his precocity, a disposition was evinced on the part of the wisest teachers of the new theology to advance farther than had been done in the preceding reign, and several changes were introduced favorable to the reformation. Yet, although the power was largely in the hands of the clergy, and more progress might have been easily made, it will hardly be doubted by those best acquainted with the history of the reformation at this period, that what was accomplished was not the result of a comprehensive view and calm investigation of all the doctrines and practices which had long been established, but the triumph rather of a specific policy, in discarding certain articles and forms which were condemned as well by the more moderate as by the more zealous opponents of Catholicism.

It was during this reign that the public prayers were revised, translated into English, and a liturgy prepared. It was during this reign that the forty-two articles of

[1] Burnet, Pref. vol. 1. 40 ; Hallam, 56 ; Bancroft, U. S., 1. 277.

[2] It was for this that the memory of Henry was principally cherished ; as

"The Majestic lord
Who broke the bonds of Rome."

That he was a confirmed sensualist, his whole life proves ; and that the church is more indebted to his violence than to his virtues, few will probably dispute.

religion were drawn up and established, though afterwards modified and reduced to thirty-nine. As a proof, however, that the principal object intended to be secured by these measures was less to enfranchise the individual conscience, or lay down broad principles of universal application, than to build up a National Church in contradistinction from the Church of Rome, persecution continued to be waged against "vagabond monks and anabaptists," the former of whom were doomed to slavery for from one to five years, and to wear a ring of iron upon their bodies;[1] a proclamation was issued prohibiting plebeian or clerical innovations under severe penalties; none were permitted to preach without license; all were to worship at the parish churches upon pain of punishment for refusing so to do; and the order of service being prescribed, all divine offices were to be performed according to it, and all refusing to comply were, for the first offense, to be imprisoned six months and forfeit a year's profit of their benefice; for the second to forfeit all church preferments and suffer a year's imprisonment; and for the third to be imprisoned for life![2]

The controversy about ceremonies is another instance in point. Luther, the Saxon reformer, intent on the propagation of his own system of theology, had moderated his views concerning ceremonial observances, and favored magnificence as an aid to devotion,—permitting the crucifix and the taper, and even pictures and images, as well as the vestments of the church, as things of indifference; whilst Calvin, the "French refugee," outstripping him in the race, and pushing the principles of Protestantism to their farthest results, avoided all appeals to the senses as coun-

[1] Stat. at Large, 1 Ed. VI., c. 2; Burnet, 2. 71, 176–9; Lingard, 7. 24.

[2] Stat. at Large, 1 Ed. VI., c. 1; 2 Ed. VI., c. 1; 5 and 6 Ed. VI., c. 1; Burnet, 2. 94–5, 148–9; 3. 293; Whitelock, 222; Lingard, 7. 22, 29, 31, 43, 60, 67, 71, 88, 91–3

CHAP. II. tenancing idolatry, and demanded a spiritual worship in its utmost simplicity.

The views of these champions spread into England; and, as the hierarchy was incorporated with the civil policy of the kingdom, prelates and peers, bishops and barons, composed the national legislature; the subordinate ranks of ecclesiastics were continued; the vestments of the clergy, and a large number of rites, sanctioned by custom and invested with the charms of immemorial antiquity, were retained; and so essential were these considered to the maintenance of the power of the church, and its influence over the masses of the people, that, though admitted to be extrinsic appendages, it was insisted that it would be unwise hastily to abolish them, and impolitic to do so without careful deliberation.

1550. Hooper set the example of opposition to these rites by refusing to be consecrated in the episcopal vestments, nor could Cranmer and Ridley shake his purpose; but after nine months contumacy and a "seasonable imprisonment," he was induced so far to forego his scruples as to submit to be attired in them when ordained, and on public occasions, but at other times he was permitted to follow his own judgment. In his reluctant compliance, however, he was not alone, though the Adiaphorists seem to have been the most numerous party. Yet though Bucer and Peter Martyr, then in England, expressed their dissatisfaction at seeing these habits retained, and Calvin and Bullinger wrote from Switzerland in the same strain, and the Helvetic divines generally applauded his consistency, upon the whole submission to the popular demand was advised, and thus for a season the dispute terminated, only to burst out anew and with increased violence a few years later.[1]

[1] Burnet, 2, 242–5, 264; 3 299–307; Lingard, 7. 75–7; Neal, 1. 51; Grahame, 1. 127.

It should be observed in passing, that this opposition to vestments was not, as has been asserted, a "senseless scruple." It was because such vestments were the badges of Popery, uncountenanced by Scripture or the usage of the first centuries, that they were so strongly condemned. It was because they were regarded as inimical to spirituality, and as symbolizing with superstition — a mystical signification being affixed to them by the Romish Church — that they were abhorred and repudiated. And, while the English Church, animated with the desire of confirming her own power, conciliating her adversaries, and reconciling the people to the renunciation of the Pope, steered a middle course, tolerating and retaining many of the ancient habits and customs, those who were radically and irreconcilably hostile to every vestige of Catholicism, suspected that church — and not wholly without reason — of a Janus-faced policy; — of temporizing, to seduce the adherents of the old religion, and to retain their hold upon the affections of the people; — and hence the bitterness and the unstinted virulence of their censures of both churches as corrupt and anti-christian.

But the bright star of Protestantism was suddenly eclipsed. Edward unfortunately expired at the early age of sixteen; and Mary, the daughter of Henry and Catherine of Arragon, who next ascended the throne, was educated a Catholic, and possessed the bigotry and pride which she inherited from her mother. The Reformation, therefore, had no charms for her. Not only did she subvert what had been done by her father and her half brother, re-establishing Catholicism with its pageantry and creed, but at the instigation of Bonner, the fierce winds of persecution were let loose upon the favorers of Protestantism, the fires of Smithfield were kindled, and eminent divines and hundreds of the laity perished at the stake, while hundreds more, fortunate enough to escape, found at Frankfort, Geneva, Basil

1553 to 1558.

CHAP. II. and Zurich, an asylum from the violence which was raging at home.[1]

Nov. 17, 1558. The career of Mary, however, was happily of short duration; and when Elizabeth, the daughter of Henry and Anne ascended the throne, by a new Act of Supremacy the kingdom was once more and permanently severed from the Papal See.[2] But the differences which had originated in the life-time of Edward, had been renewed in Germany and Switzerland among the exiles of Mary's reign. Surrounded by the influence of Calvin and his associates, those who were anxious for more purity of worship, and who recognized, though imperfectly, the distinguishing principle of Protestantism, — the right of private judgment to every human soul, — labored to free themselves wholly from unscriptural ceremonies; while the friends of the Anglican Church clung to its policy and supported its practices.[3] The former, by permission, had settled at Frankfort; and though the liturgy was used in their church, the responses were omitted; the litany, the surplice, and other things were dispensed with; and in the sacraments, those parts were rejected which were deemed superstitious and superfluous.[4]

1556. Scarcely had this church been established a year, ere Dr. Cox, the former tutor of Edward VI., came to Frankfort, broke through the rules which had been adopted, and caused the litany to be used, and the responses to be made. This led to a controversy, which "neither the honor of God, the common persecution, nor the mediation of Calvin" could wholly assuage. Accusations of rebellion and charges

[1] Stat. at Large, 1 and 2 Phil. & Mary, c. 8; Fuller 1. 405, ed. 1656; Burnet, 3. 408; Strype, Mem., 3. 146, ed. 1721; Fox, 3. 96–7, ed. 1684; Chron. Pil., 9.

[2] Stat. at Large., 1 Eliz., c. 1; Whitelock, 225.

[3] Bradford, in Chron. Phil., 10.

[4] The principal authority on these matters, used by all historians, is the Treatise on the Troubles at Frankfort, published in 1575. A copy of this work is in the Prince Library, at the rooms of the Mass. Hist. Soc.

of high treason were preferred;[1] and so bitter was the strife that the church was completely broken up. Fox, the martyrologist, with his associates, retired to Basil; Whittingham, and Knox, the Scottish Reformer, settled at Geneva; and Cox and his adherents remained at Frankfort. Time, the calmer of the passions of men, alone softened the asperities of this unhappy schism; and before leaving the country to return to their native land, a reconciliation was prepared by concessions to the Puritans; the churches passed letters of mutual love, promised to forget the differences which had divided them, and agreed to unite in forwarding the reformation, and in procuring the abolishment of offensive ceremonies: — pledges which were afterwards partially redeemed.[2] CHAP. II. 1555.

Upon the accession of Elizabeth the exiles returned, and those who had hid in the houses of their friends emerged from their concealment and ventured once more to appear. But the constitution of her Majesty's Council, and the arbitrary course early adopted by the Queen, and resolutely adhered to throughout her reign, soon satisfied the Puritans that there was very little hope of a farther reformation in religious affairs, and that the chief aim of her Majesty and her able advisers, was to build up more firmly her own power through the aid of the Church, whose interests were identified with the interests of the Crown. Instead, therefore, of resuming the work begun in her half-brother's reign, and carrying it on to its full fruition, as many of the clergy hoped she would do, she seemed well contented to leave things as he had left them, and to make no changes calcu- 1558.

[1] Fuller, 2. 27, et seq.

[2] Strype, Ann., 1. 103–5, ed. 1725; Burnet, 2. 528; Neal, 1. 71; Prince, 217–18; Hallam, 105–6. Puritanism originated with Hooper, in 1550, but the name was not applied until 1564. Strype, Ann., 1. 459–65. A notice of Whittingham, the distinguished leader of the Frankfort Church, may be seen in N. Eng. Gen. and Hist. Reg., 5. 150, 311. Comp. also 1 M. H. Coll., 5. 206.

CHAP. II. 1558 to 1581.

lated essentially to impair the effectiveness of the Established religion.[1]

Had the objectionable and unscriptural parts of the Common Prayer been removed, or the ceremonies left indifferent; had the popish habits been exchanged for more comely garments, and the Pope's decrees, with the ex-officio inquisition oath abolished; the general frame of diocesan episcopacy would, very probably, have remained untouched, and the body of the people might have continued in the Church without much uneasiness.[2] But the supremacy of the Crown being provided for and decreed, an Act of Parliament in the first year of her reign established the uniformity of Common Prayer under severe penalties for non-compliance; and subscription to the habits, the ceremonies, and the thirty-nine articles being subsequently required,[3] by these, and other enactments of her reign, especially the re-erection of the Court of High Commission, with its tremendous and superlatively inquisitorial machinery, the scruples of the Puritans were wholly overlooked in the common zeal to assert and support the supremacy of the National Church. As a natural consequence, persecution ensued. The Puritans were a sect; this made them a faction. Opposition, so far from destroying, served only to radicate their principles and increase their power. In all classes of society their followers were found, though most numerous among the tradesmen in the towns, and the small proprietors and protestant gentry in the country; and long before the close of their reign they began to return a majority of the House of Commons.[4]

The position of the parties to this contest — both of whom were probably equally sincere — was not eminently calculated to beget feelings of urbanity; and coarse pleas-

[1] Burnet, 2. 582; Whitelock, 226.
[2] Prince, 231; Hallam, 109.
[3] Stat. at Large, 13 Eliz., c. 12.
[4] Robertson, lib. 10. § 7, 8; Persons, 242, 244, in Hallam, 116; Macauly, 1. 57.

antry and bitter invective perpetually exasperated the violence of controversy. If Martin Mar Prelate — that vizored knight — is censured for his ribaldry, and for the profanity of his wit, the churchlings who replied to him were guilty of similar excesses. Theological gladiators have never been fastidious in their choice of epithets, and the ruder the jest or the more trenchant the sarcasm, the more pleasure such sallies have usually excited. On neither side was there a superabundance of courtesy or charity. It was an age of insane religious intolerance; the vocabulary of vituperation was utterly exhausted; and the spirit of detraction exulted in affixing the stigma of disgrace upon those it denounced as heretics and apostates. Both sides were faulty, and, so far as an intemperate zeal is concerned, one is as amenable to censure as the other. If the Puritans, to wash their skirts, cast the odium of their sins upon their opponents of the English Church, they, in their turn, will cast the odium of their sins upon the old Church of Rome. The leaven of error was by no means purged out from the most advanced Protestant minds, nor even at the present day has it disappeared from all. We blame, therefore, the Puritans as well as the Anglican Church; and the best atonement which can be made for such excesses, is for Christians of the present day to lay aside bitterness and malignant invective, and display, in their dealings with each other, and in their sectarian controversies, more of that charity which is the chief of the graces, and the purest ornament of the character of the Christian.

It must not be forgotten, however, in defining the position of Puritanism in the reign of Elizabeth, that the controversies which convulsed the kingdom, and threatened almost to banish from the world the gentleness of the gospel, were not wholly confined to the tippet and the surplice, the square cap and the liturgy. The Puritans were the har-

CHAP. II. 1558 to 1581.

bingers of a political as well as of a moral revolution. They aimed not only to restore Christianity to its primitive simplicity, purging the church of the corruptions of ages, but they aimed also to overthrow the idea, then the main pillar of the prerogatives of royalty, that we should obey men rather than God. Doubtless the ultimate tendency of their views was to republicanism rather than to monarchy. They would yield, in religion, nothing arbitrarily to the temporal sovereign. It was their motto that, in church matters, God's word was the guide. And though they cannot be properly accused of open disloyalty, it must at the same time be acknowledged that their loyalty did not extend so far as to approbate the doctrine of passive obedience. And because the Church and the State were considered one and inseparable, and the unity of the former was deemed the safety of the latter, non-conformity was persecuted on the plea of necessity. This is the true secret of the opposition of the English Church to Puritanism and Independency. This Church, like that of Rome, had virtually assumed its own infallibility. It had driven down the stakes which were never more to be removed. It had interwoven the hierarchy with the whole temporal constitution of the realm. It had built up a system midway between Puritanism and the despotism of the Catholic Church. And the test of loyalty was undeviating conformity to the canons of the Church, and implicit obedience to the mandates of the Crown. The Church was yet in its infancy, surrounded by subtile foes. The State was trembling upon the verge of revolution. And the instinct of self-preservation prompted persecution of all who refused to put forth their hands to aid in supporting the ark of the Lord and the supremacy of the Crown.[1]

[1] The language of the Queen, in her Speech at proroguing the Parliament, in 1585, confirms the statement of the text. See Parl. Hist. Eng., 4. 279; Camden, in Kennet, 503; D'Ewes' Journal, 328; Robertson, lib. 10. § 5, note.

If this, however, was the policy of the government of England, — and that it was who will deny? — it was the natural result of such a policy to beget, on the part of the Puritans, an attachment equally strong to the peculiarities of their religious system; and upon their removal to America, the same principle of self-defense prompted the caution which was used in laying the foundations of their infant commonwealth, to guard it with jealous watchfulness against the aggressions and encroachments of Episcopacy, which they had learned to mistrust, and to build up a community exclusively of their own faith, as in England non-conformity was neither tolerated nor allowed. In England, Puritans could not enjoy the full privileges of Churchmen, because of their non-conformity. They were as sincere in their dissent from that Church, as the Church was sincere in its own professions and practices. And the same reasoning which condemns the policy of the Puritans, condemns with equal severity the policy of the Anglican Church. We say not that either was right, absolutely and fully; but we do say that, in our estimation, Puritanism, notwithstanding its errors and its early excesses, contained the seminal principles of true religious toleration; and that, as experience enlightened the judgment of the professors of that faith, and as circumstances sanctioned the adoption of a more liberal policy, measures were promptly taken to initiate so desirable a reform, and the world is now reaping the fruits of Puritan iconoclasm and asceticism.

But to return to the history of Puritanism in England. For several years following the accession of Elizabeth, and especially while the attention of the Queen was particularly turned to the suppression of Popery, in which she was essentially aided by the Puritans, there was no extensive secession from the National Church. Yet before all fears of the Romish ascendancy were removed by the death of Queen Mary, the laws against non-conformity were zealously

CHAP. II. brought to bear in a different direction; and the Puritans, though as a body they made no strenuous objections to the lawfulness of ecclesiastical government, when they found that persecution continued to oppose them, that reform was hopeless, and that rule or ruin was the motto of the day, sent forth a party of stern, intrepid, and uncompromising spirits, who, unawed, but baited into an almost savage stubbornness and hostility, refused longer to commune with a Church many of whose ceremonies were reprobated, and whose government had become odious, intolerant and oppressive.[1]

A few separate congregations were formed so early as 1567;[2] in 1570 Cartwright entered the field;[3] and in 1572 the "first born of all presbyteries" was established at Wandworth in Surrey.[4] But it was not until nine years
1581. after, that opposition to Episcopacy and its concomitants reached its culminating point. A new sect then made its appearance, at first called Brownists, from Robert Brown, its earliest advocate, who had been a preacher in the diocese of Norwich, and who was descended from an ancient and respectable family in Rutlandshire. He was educated at Corpus Christi, Cambridge; was a schoolmaster in Southwark; then a lecturer at Islington; and finally a preacher, inveighing against the ceremonies and discipline of the Establishment, and asserting the highly democratic and peculiarly unpalatable doctrine of the independency and complete jurisdiction of every church in its own affairs.[5]

From his subsequent apostasy, his followers very properly refused to be called by his name, and were known as Sepa-

[1] Parl. Hist. Eng., 4. 260, 353.
[2] Strype's Parker, 242; Strype's Grindal, 114–16; Fuller, 2. 81; Cotton's Way., 3, 4; Baillie's Dissuasive, 13; Robinson's Justification, 50; Neal, 1. 104-9; Hallam, 111; Bradford, in Chron. Pil., 443.
[3] Hallam, 113; Neal, 1. 114.
[4] Fuller, 2. 103; Neal, 1. 126; Prince, 233.
[5] Neal, 1. 119, 149; Baillie's Dissuasive, 13.

ratists, or Independents.[1] But questionable as was his sin- CHAP. II.
cerity, and inconstant as were his professions, so congenial were the doctrines he taught to the views of the people that he easily succeeded in gathering a large congregation; and after its dispersion and his own defection, the seed which had been scattered so rapidly grew, that Sir Walter Ra- 1592.
leigh, in a speech in Parliament, computed the number of separatists or "Brownists" at twenty thousand.[2]

There were now at least four classes or parties in religion in England: — the Catholics, who adhered to the Church of Rome; the members of the English Church; the Puritans; and the Separatists or Independents. Of the third class were the founders of the Massachusetts Colony, and to the fourth belonged the settlers at Plymouth. The former — the Puritans — were simply non-conformists. Connected with the National Church, they questioned chiefly the propriety of some of her observances. They submitted to her authority so far as they could, and acknowledged her as their "mother" in all matters of doctrinal concern. Their clergy were educated at her colleges, and ordained by her bishops; the laity were connected with her by many of the dearest ties; and up to the date of their removal to America, they made no open secession from her communion, and had liberty been allowed them, they would probably have continued in the land of their nativity, and in the bosom of the Establishment.[3]

The Plymouth colonists were not of the National Church. Years before their expatriation they had renounced her communion, and formed churches of their own. Between them, however, and the Massachusetts colonists, the differ-

[1] It has long been the fashion to stigmatize, by way of reproach, as *Brownists*, all the early settlers of New England; but the injustice of this proceeding will, we think, be evident to every candid mind. See Cotton's Way. of Cong. Churches Cleared, 5; Bradford, in Chron. Pil., 416, 444.

[2] D'Ewes' Journal, 1. 517.

[3] Cotton's Way., 13; Baillie's Dissuasive, 21; Neal, 1. 244; Revolution in N. Eng. Justified, 5.

CHAP. II. ences which existed were in matters of policy rather than in articles of faith; and on arriving in the New World, apart from the influences of their native land, and under circumstances of a far different character, a few years intercourse assimilated their views and cemented their union.[1]

Such was the origin of Puritanism and Independency; and though, in the history of both these sects, as well as of the English and the Romish Churches, we shall find much intolerance displayed, the result of this contest for greater individualism in religious affairs has been, to induce watchfulness of all encroachments upon the rights of conscience; and happy changes have followed in all Protestant communities where these rights are respected and secured.

We must now pass to the history of the church of the
1592. Pilgrims. So early as 1592, a church was gathered at London, of which Francis Johnson was chosen pastor, and John Greenwood became the teacher; but this church being broken up by the authorities, and its teacher imprisoned, the pastor, with a portion of his flock, escaped to Holland, and settled at Amsterdam, where for many years they continued to abide.[2]

A few years later another church was gathered, "to the north of the Trent," in a rural district "near the joining borders of Nottinghamshire, Lincolnshire, and Yorkshire." This was the church of the Pilgrims, which, though first established at Gainsborough, was afterwards formed into two bodies, and the junior ordinarily met for public worship at the house of William Brewster, well known as the Elder of the church at Plymouth. This eminent man, so famous

[1] Robinson's Apology, passim; Winslows's Hypocrisy Unmasked,ed. 1646; Bradford, in Chron. Pil., 390, 415, 427; Baillie's Dissuasive, 32, 33, 55, 56, 59; Cotton's Way, 17; Hunter's Founders, 163–78.

[2] Cotton's Way, 6; Baillie's Dissuasive, 14, 15; Bradford, in Chron. Pil., 24. 424, 445–7; Stow, 765; Brandt, Hist. Ref., 1. 479; Neal, 1. 198, 242–3; Prince, 104, 235. The learned Henry Ainsworth, "a man of a thousand," is said to have accompanied this church to Holland, and to have been connected with it as teacher.

in the annals of the Plymouth Colony, is supposed to have been born in Suffolk, England, in 1560, or 1564. Having received in early life a suitable education, he became a student at Cambridge, and afterwards an attaché to William Davison, Esq., a polished courtier of the reign of Elizabeth, her Secretary of State, and her Ambassador to Holland, whither Mr. Brewster accompanied him, "being esteemed rather as a son than a servant." Withdrawing from public life when his employer was displaced, Mr. Brewster received an appointment before April, 1594, as Postmaster at Scrooby, in Nottinghamshire, and there resided until his removal to Holland, faithfully discharging the duties of his office, and devoting himself zealously to the interests of the church with which he was connected.[1]

April, 1594.

The location of this church, and the history of its patron, have been involved for years in more or less obscurity; but recently, through the successful researches of the Rev. Joseph Hunter, Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of London, and an Assistant Keeper of Her Majesty's Records, many new facts have been brought to light, whose importance we cannot too highly appreciate. It may now be considered as satisfactorily proved, that the Church of the Pilgrims was first gathered at Gainsborough, and afterwards at Scrooby, in that part of Nottingham known as "the Hundred of Basset-Lawe," a mile and a half south of the market town of Bawtry, on the borders of York, and only a short distance from the verge of Lincolnshire.

Scrooby, at present, is an obscure agricultural village, with few objects of interest beside its church; but anciently it was a place of much more note, and was surrounded by

[1] See Bradford's Life of Brewster, in Chron. Pil., Chap. xxvii.; but especially, Rev. Joseph Hunter's "Founders of New Plymouth," published at London, in 1854, pp. 53–68. Comp. also, Cotton's Way, 4; Morton's Mem.; Hubbard, 43; Belknap's Biog., Art. Brewster; and 4 M. H. Coll., 1. 64–7.

CHAP. II.

religious houses even before the Reformation. Situated near the high road from York to London, it was, on that account, a convenient resting place for the Archbishops of York in their journeys to the metropolis; and lying near the celebrated Hatfield Chace, it was, on that account, a favorite resort for the enjoyment of field-sports. It was the frequent residence of Ap. Savage, in the reign of Henry VII.; it was for many weeks the abode of Cardinal Wolsey in his disgrace; and it was the rendezvous of the Earl of Shrewsbury and his contingent, when he joined the army of the King assembled to oppose "the Pilgrimage of Grace."[1] In the reign of Elizabeth the manor was alienated by Ap. Sandys, and settled upon his son Sir Samuel Sandys; and thenceforth it became a private possession, sometimes inhabited by the Sandyses themselves, and sometimes occupied by tenants. Mr. Brewster was its tenant at the time hé dwelt there as Postmaster of the village.

Gov. Bradford has left us the names of two ministers, formerly Puritans, who seceded from the National Church, and resided at or near Scrooby: — John Smith, "a man of able gifts and a good preacher," and Richard Clifton, "a grave and reverend preacher, who by his pains and diligence had done much good, and under God, had been a means of the conversion of many."[3] Mr. Smith was the pastor of the church at Gainsborough, which is supposed to have been gathered before that at Scrooby;[4] but lacking the spirit of gentleness which the gospel commends, he seems to have been in favor with few of his cotemporaries. Mr. Clifton, who was born at Normanton, Derby-

[1] See Stow, 574.

[2] Hunter's Sketch, in 4 M. H. Coll., 1. 54–7, and his "Founders of New Plymouth," 16–26, 139, 140; Leland's Itinerary, 1. 35, ed. Hearne; Dugdale's Eng. and Wales Delin., 1369.

[3] Bradford, in Chron. Pil., 22–3, 453; also Baillie's Dissuasive, 1. For fuller notices of Smith, see Brooks' Lives of the Puritans; Bradford, in Chron. Pil., 450; Hunter's Founders, &c., 32–5; Neal, 1. 243, note.

[4] Smith's Parrallels, &c.; Hunter's Founders, 33.

shire, about 1553, is supposed to have been the person who, CHAP. II.
in 1585, was instituted to the vicarage of Marnham, near Newark upon Trent; and in July, 1586, he is known to have had charge of the rectory of Babworth, in the heart of Basset-Lawe.[1] Forsaking the Established Church, he became pastor or teacher of the church in Brewster's house, after its separate organization, accompanied that church in its exile to Holland, and died at Amsterdam in 1616.[2]

The most noted of the seceding ministers, however, whose name is connected with the history of the Pilgrims, was John Robinson, who, even by Baillie, — no friend to his views, — is called "the most learned, polished, and modest spirit" that ever separated from the Church of England.[3] Of the parentage and early history of this celebrated man, nothing is certainly known. He was probably born in Nottingham, or Lincolnshire, in 1575, and at the age of seventeen, is supposed to have entered Corpus Christi, Cambridge,[4] and on completing his term at the University, he proceeded to Norfolk, and in the neighborhood of or at Norwich, commenced his labors in the National Church.[5] But his scruples respecting the ceremonies of this Church being immovably fixed, he omitted or modified them in his parochial labors. This subjecting him to annoyance, he was temporarily suspended from his clerical functions; and after applying unsuccessfully for the Mastership of the Great Hospital, or for a building to be secured to him by lease in which he might officiate, he withdrew entirely from the Church, and became an open seceder; — not as "the victim of chagrin and disappointment," as has been ungen-

[1] Hunter, 42.

[2] Hunter, 44, from Records in the Clifton Family Bible. See also, Bradford, in Chron. Pil., 453; and 4 M. H. Coll., 1. 61.

[3] Dissuasive, 17. See also Cotton's Way, 7.

[4] 4 M. H. Coll., 1. 113–14; Hunter, 92–3.

[5] Neal, 1. 244; Hanbury, Mem. Indep's, 1839, vol. 1. 185, et seq.; 4 M. H. Coll., 1. 73, 74, 115, note; Hunter, 94–96.

CHAP. II.

erously insinuated,[1] but "on most sound and unresistable convictions;" for it required at that time no ordinary courage to avow one's self a separatist, when persecution, if not death, was the doom of all dissidents.[2]

Proceeding to Lincolnshire and Nottingham, he there found a body of men who, "urged with apparitors, pursuivants and the Commission Courts," met for worship as often as they could escape the Argus eyes of their persecutors; — somewhat, perhaps, like the Covenanters of Scotland, who,

> "Long ere the dawn, by devious ways,
> O'er hills, through woods, o'er dreary wastes they sought
> The upland muirs,"

knowing the dangers to which they were exposed. These holy men, "whose hearts the Lord had touched with heavenly zeal for his truth," and who, notwithstanding all the opprobrium which has been cast upon them, we must
1602. still believe were animated by a fervent piety, had already constituted themselves into a church, by solemn covenant with the Lord and with each other, "to walk in all his ways, made known or to be made known unto them, according to their best endeavors, WHATEVER IT SHOULD COST THEM."[3]

Secretary Morton is the only early writer who gives the date of the establishment of this church; and if that date is correct, and if the statement of Mr. Hunter is also correct, that the church at Gainsborough is older than that at Scrooby,[4] the church now gathered was probably located at Gainsborough; Mr. Smith and Mr. Clifton were associated in its oversight; and Mr. Robinson may have joined them in 1604.[5]

[1] Pagett, Heresiog., 63, ed. 1655; Dr. J. Hall, Works, vol. 9.
[2] Hunter, in 4 M. H. Coll., 1. 117.
[3] Bradford, in Chron. Pil., 21; Morton's Mem., 1, ed. 1669; Prince, 4.
[4] Hunter's Founders, &c., 33.
[5] Mem. Robinson, in 4 M. H. Collections, 1. 118. Mr. Hunter, Founders, &c., 96, thinks he took the office assigned him in the Basset-Lawe Church, in 1606 or 1607.

But if the first church was gathered at Gainsborough, "in regard of distance of place these people became two distinct bodies or churches,"[1] that at Gainsborough continuing under the oversight of Mr. Smith, and that at Scrooby being organized under Mr. Clifton, with whom Mr. Robinson remained as an assistant; and this event probably took place early in 1606.[2]

Such was the origin of the churches at Gainsborough and Scrooby. That at Scrooby, though it seems to have been second in point of time, is first in importance in the history of the Pilgrims; for here the choice and noble spirits who planted New England learned the lessons of truth and liberty. Here, under the faithful ministrations of their excellent teachers, they were nourished and strengthened to that vigorous fortitude and manly endurance, which braved all dangers and conquered all obstacles. Here, breathing the air of spiritual freedom, they acquired that courage which enabled them to sacrifice home and its charms, and expatriate themselves to distant lands, rather than abandon their principles, or yield to what they regarded as an unrighteous encroachment upon their ecclesiastical privileges.[3]

It will be noticed that Mr. Robinson appears upon the stage at about the date of the accession of James I., the greatest pedant that ever sat upon the English throne. Educated a Presbyterian of the school of Knox, and professing a sincere and sacred regard for that Church, this

1603.

[1] Bradford, in Chron. Pil., 22.

[2] We base this upon the statement of Gov. Bradford, in Chron. Pil., 24, who says they "continued together about a year" before undertaking the removal to Holland. But Mr. Hunter, Founders, &c., 41, 53, who agrees in assigning the year 1606 as the date of the organization of this church, seems to represent its distinct beginning as taking place after the removal of Mr. Smith's Church to Holland, which he thinks was in 1604. See, however, note 1, p. 57, and comp. Bradford, in Chron. Pil., 22, who speaks of the two churches as co-existing before the removal of Smith.

[3] Mem. Robinson, in 4 M. H. Coll., 1. 120.

CHAP. II.

Prince had twice subscribed the "solemn league and covenant,"—in 1581, and in 1590.[1] At the General Assembly in Edinburgh, in the latter year, standing with his bonnet off and his hands lifted to heaven, he blessed God that he was "king of such a kirk, the sincerest kirk in the world," and condemned the service of the English Church as an "evil said mass." "I charge you," he added, "I charge you, my good ministers, doctors, elders, nobles, gentlemen, and barons, to stand to your purity, and to exhort the people to do the same; and I, forsooth, so long as I brook my life, shall maintain the same."[2] Even on leaving Scotland to take possession of the English Crown, he gave public thanks in the kirk on the Sabbath, and affirmed that, "as God had promoted him to a greater power, he must endeavor to establish religion and take away corruption in both the countries;" and that he had "so settled both kirk and kingdom in that state which he intended not to alter anyways, his subjects living in peace."[3]

Apr. 3, 1603.

Such declarations naturally excited the hopes of the Puritans. But alas! the "Scotch mist" was soon dispelled! James was a dissembler. It was the failing of his life that his word was no bond. Arbitrary, capricious, tyrannical and unprincipled, he trampled upon the most solemn oaths, and seemed never better pleased than when torturing or anathematizing the victims of his vengeance.[4] Hence at the Hampton Court Conference,—that supremely ridiculous farce, and compound at once of both kingcraft and priestcraft,—the Monarch, showing clearly like his predecessors, that his favorite religion was that which most

Jan. 14, 1603-4.

[1] Neal, vol. 1.

[2] Calderwood, 255, 256.

[3] Calderwood, 256, 473, ed. 1680; Sanderson's Life of James I., 295, 302; Neal, 1. 227.

[4] Burnet, Own Times, 1. 17, says of James, he "was become the scorn of the age; and while hungry writers flattered him out of measure at home, he was despised by all abroad, as a pedant without true judgment, courage, or steadiness."

favored arbitrary power, commenced spitting his venom upon the principles of his youth. "I will have none of that liberty as to ceremonies," said he. "I will have one doctrine and one discipline, one religion in substance and in ceremony." "No bishop, no king," was his favorite motto. Of the Scottish Presbytery, his "own pure kirk," he declared it "agreed with monarchy as well as God and the devil." And at the close of the second day of the conference, speaking of the Puritans, he said: "I shall make them conform themselves, or I will harry them out of the land, or else do worse."[1] CHAP. II.

On the third and last day of the Conference, the King defended the Court of High Commission, the Articles of Religion, the Book of Common Prayer, and the oath *ex-officio*, and said: "If any, after things were well ordered, would not be quiet and show his obedience, the Church were better without him, and he were worthy to be hanged." The Puritans were repeatedly insulted by the King, and treated with the grossest indignity and insolence; yet the loftiest bishops fed his vanity with fulsome flatteries and blasphemous eulogiums. "Undoubtedly," exclaimed Whitgift, the Ap. of Canterbury, "Your Majesty speaks by the special assistance of God's Spirit." Bp. Bancroft, on his knees, affirmed that "his heart melted within him with joy, because God had given England such a king as since Christ's time had not been." And James himself, in a foolish epistle to Mr. Blake, a Scotchman, boasted that he had "soundly peppered off the Puritans."[2] Jan. 18.

In his speech at the opening of the first Parliament, the King acknowledged the Roman Church to be his Mother Church, though defiled with some infirmities and corrup- Mar. 19, 1603-4.

[1] Barlow's Sum and Substance, 36, 82, 83, 102; Sanderson's James I., 303, 304; Whitelock, 286.

[2] Barlow, 83, 92, 94, 98; Calderwood, 474, et seq.; Sanderson's James I., 303, 304; Neal's Puritans; Strype's Whitgift, App., 239.

CHAP. II.

tions, and professed his readiness, if its priests would sake their "new and gross corruptions," to meet them h way; but the Puritans, for "their discontent with present government, and impatience to suffer any sup ority," he declared to be "a sect insufferable in a w governed commonwealth;" and in one of his letters says: "I had rather live like a hermit, than be a ki over such a people as the pack of Puritans are that overr the lower house."[1]

July 16, 1604.

Finally a proclamation was issued, ordering the Purit clergy to conform before the last of November, or to di pose of themselves and families in some other way, a "unfit for their obstinacy and contempt to occupy suc places."[2] In consequence of this edict, a large number o ministers were ejected, some of whom had preached ten some twenty, and some even thirty years; the bloodhound of persecution were slipped from their leash, and the king dom was converted into a general hunting-ground, with th King himself to shout the "View! Halloo!" and the myr midoms of office to join in the cry; — the objects of his vengeance being the subjects of his realm, fleeing from

"A tyrant's and a bigot's bloody laws."

Without doubt this conduct of the King was consistent with his position, and with the policy of the Church of which he was the head. That it was, however, a mistaken policy — as mistaken as that of the Puritans, who persecuted dissidents from their faith — few, probably, of the candid members of the Episcopal Church will hesitate to acknowledge. The errors of past ages are lessons for the present. And we rejoice that a better spirit is beginning to be evinced among all sects of Christians.

[1] King James's Speech, p. 4. Lond., 1604, in Stow, 840–1; Calderwood, 478; Sanderson's James I., 319; Neal's Puritan's, vol. 1.

[2] Barlow, 105; Sanderson's James I., 306.

Such being the "tender mercies" of the monarch into whose hands the Puritans fell, what else could have been expected but stripes and banishment? The Independent Churches at Scrooby and Gainsborough suffered with the rest; and, unable to conceal themselves from the inquisitions of the spy, beset in their houses, driven from their homes, and incarcerated in prisons, "so as their former afflictions were but as mole-hills to mountains in comparison to those which now came upon them," they resolved to escape. Mr. Smith and his church were the first to depart, fleeing to Holland, and seeking a refuge at Amsterdam.[1] Here, joining with the church under Francis Johnson, which had been established several years, Mr. Smith became involved in contentions with his predecessors, and that division was produced which has been often, but unjustly, ascribed to the members of Mr. Robinson's Church.[2]

Mr. Robinson and his flock yet tarried for a season in England, hoping something would transpire to lull the fierceness of the storm which was raging; but month after month passed away, and no abatement of its fury was visible. Accordingly, although thought by many "an adventure almost desperate, a case intolerable, and a misery worse than death," he resolved to flee to a land where toleration, at least, if not perfect freedom, was accorded to all.

But it was easier to resolve than it was to effect an

[1] Mr. Hunter, Founders, &c., 33, 89, is of opinion that Mr. Smith fled to Holland in 1604; but if the church at Gainsborough was not divided until 1606, as seems probable from the statement of Gov. Bradford, Mr. Smith without doubt continued with it until that time, as we find no intimations of his leaving before the separation took place; and besides, the Proclamation of the King, which was the probable cause of his departure, was not carried into effect until after Nov. 1604. It must be acknowledged, however, that we are yet in want of more light before we can speak with confidence on any of these points; and we have preferred in the text to use those vexatious words which imply uncertainty, rather than to risk broad assertions, which future investigations may require to be modified.

[2] Baillie, Dissuasive, 54, was the originator of this charge. For its refutation see Cotton's Way, 6–8; Bradford, in Chron. Pil., 450–1.

CHAP. II.

escape; for ports and havens were shut against them, so that they were compelled to seek secret means of conveyance, fee mariners, and pay extraordinary rates for their passage. Thrice was the attempt made before they succeeded.

Oct. 1607.?

The first attempt[1] was from Boston, in Lincolnshire, and "a great company" hired a ship, the master of which was to be in readiness to receive them at the time and place fixed for their embarkation. He came at length, but not on the day appointed, and took them in at night.[2] But no sooner were they in his power than they were betrayed into the hands of the officers, who thrust them into open boats, rifled their goods, took away their books, searched them to their shirts for money,—"even the women farther than became modesty,"—and hurried them to the town "a spectacle and a wonderment to the multitude, which came flocking on all sides to behold them." Here, after a month's imprisonment, during which the magistrates treated the fugitives courteously, the greater part were dismissed, only seven of the principal men, of whom Mr. Brewster was one, being detained and bound over to the ensuing assizes.[3]

March. 1607-8.?

Early the next Spring[4] a second attempt was made. A Dutch ship from Zealand was hired, which then lay at Hull,

[1] As the office of Mr. Brewster at Scrooby was vacated Sept. 30, 1607, we incline to the opinion that the first attempt to reach Holland was made that fall, and probably soon after he was removed from or resigned his situation as postmaster. Mr. Hunter, Founders, 132–3, speaks as if the first two attempts were cotemporaneous; but in this we think he is mistaken.

[2] It was not to "avoid suspicion" that they embarked at night. (Mem. Robinson, in 4 M. H. Coll., 1. 121.) It was the captain's act in taking them in at that time. Bradford, in Chron. Pil., 26.

[3] Bradford, in Chron. Pil., 26–7, 465; Hutchinson, 2. 405; Mather, 1. 102.

[4] We base the date in the text on the fact that Gov. Bradford, in Chron. Pil., 24, says the removal to Holland was effected partly in 1607; and from a document published by Mr. Hunter, 4 M. H. Coll., 1. 75, and Founders, &c. 19, 131, we learn that Mr. Brewster and others were cited to appear before an ecclesiastical court Ap. 22, 1608, and were not present. It is probable, therefore, that he had left before that time, and if in 1607, as Gov. Bradford says, it may have been in March, 1607–8.

and the Captain was to take them in between Grimsby and Hull, "where was a large common, a good way distant from any town." The women, children, and goods were forwarded to this place by water, and the men followed by land. But the vessel in which the former sailed arriving a day too soon, and the waters being rough, the women, who were sea-sick, persuaded the seamen to put into a neighboring creek, where the vessel grounded until the next noon. The Dutch Captain was at his post punctual to his appointment,[1] and fearing pursuit, he sent his boat to take in the men, who were walking on the shore. One boat-load passed to the vessel; and as she returned for more, "a great company, both horse and foot, with bills, and guns, and other weapons," were espied rapidly approaching; and the Captain, alarmed for his own safety, and swearing his country's oath — "Sacramente!" — "weighed his anchor, hoisted sails, and away." The few exiles on board, with no farewell to wife or children, destitute of clothing except what they had on, and of money to provide for their future support, after a storm of fourteen days, during seven of which nor sun, nor moon, nor stars were visible, were driven on the coast of Norway; but eventually, through the blessing of God, they succeeded in reaching their destined haven. The men left behind for the most part escaped; "but pitiful it was to see the heavy case of these poor women in this distress; what weeping and crying on every side; some for their husbands that were carried away in the ship; others not knowing what should become of them and their little ones; others melted in tears, seeing their poor little ones hanging about them, crying for fear, and quaking with cold." They were apprehended; hurried from place to

CHAP. II.

[1] Mr. Hunter, Founders, 134, says the Dutch Captain *deceived* the emigrants, and upon some real or pretended alarm sailed away; but this statement seems to us hardly justified by the language of Gov. Bradford.

CHAP. II.

place; and, after enduring "misery enough," were suffered to depart.[1]

Aug., 1608.

The third attempt was more successful, and in August 1608, we find Mr. Clifton, and probably Mr. Robinson, safely arrived and settled in Holland;[2]—a "new world" to them, because of its "uncouth language, different manners and customs, and strange fashions and attires." Rejoicing, however, in their escape, they were soon united with their former companions, and are said to have become one with the original members of the church at Amsterdam.[3]

But though the members of the Scrooby church settled first at Amsterdam, their stay in that city was transient; for difficulties had already arisen there, and it was thought best to remove before they became personally involved in them.[4] Leyden, "a fair and beautiful city, and of a sweet situation, made more famous by the University with which it was adorned," was the place to which their steps were turned; and "though wanting in that traffic by sea which Amsterdam enjoyed, it was not so beneficial for their outward means of living and estates," yet as a peaceful retreat, free from oppression, it was resolved to make it their abode; and the removal was probably effected in the spring of 1609.[5]

Their temporal circumstances in this strange land—"the battle ground of Europe," and "the amphitheatre of the world"—were the first to engage their attention. Most of them had been "only used to a plain country life, and the innocent trade of husbandry," and they were now in "the principal manufacturing town of the Netherlands, and one

[1] Bradford, in Chron. Pil., 27–31. Mr. Brewster was probably among those who escaped at this time, and Mr. William Bradford.

[2] Mem. Robinson, in 4 M.H. Coll., 1. 122; Hunter's Founders, 44.

[3] Mem. Robinson, in 4 M. H. Coll., 1. 123.

[4] Bradford, in Chron. Pil., 34.

[5] I base this on the statement of Bradford, in Prince, 26, who says the removal was effected "about the beginning of the twelve years truce," which was concluded Ap. 9, 1609. Morton, Mem., 2, says 1610.

of the most important in Europe." A change of occupation, therefore, became necessary to nearly all; and they "fell to such trades and employments as they best could, valuing peace and their spiritual comfort above any other riches whatever." Mr. Robinson, their pastor, now ordained to the charge of the church,[1] and not blessed with an abundance of temporal goods, was obliged to resort to some secular pursuit for support.[2] Mr. Brewster, now chosen ruling elder, whose family was large and whose means were exhausted, engaged in teaching; and the youth of Leyden, with many gentlemen, both Danes and Germans, received his instructions, especially in the English tongue. Here, too, having established a printing press, he published several books, some of which, of a prohibited character, being "vented underhandedly" in England, the ire of the Scotch Prince was aroused, and a "schout," at his instance, was employed by the magistrates of Leyden to apprehend the offender; but the "schout" being a "dull, drunken fellow," he "took one man for another," and by a fortunate mistake, *Brewer*, not *Brewster*, was "confined fast in the university's prison."[3]

We must not, however, omit to notice here one of the exiles, who, though but a youth at this time, became subsequently one of the first members of the Colony of Plymouth, and exerted for many years a decided influence upon its fortunes and destiny. We refer to William Bradford, best known as "Governor Bradford." Born at the little village of Austerfield, in Yorkshire, in 1588, he was trained by his grand parents and uncles, at the decease of his father, "to the affairs of husbandry," the occupation of his ancestors.

[1] Robinson's Works, 1. 463-4; Bradford, in Chron. Pil., 36.

[2] Mem. Robinson, in 4 M. H. Coll., 1. 124. This is a conjectural statement, yet highly probable, as even the learned Ainsworth was for some time a porter in a bookseller's shop.

[3] Bradford's Life of Brewster, in Chron. Pil., 466; Sir Dudley Carleton's Letters, 380, 386, 390, 437, ed. 1757.

CHAP. II. 1610 to 1617.

His education was such as usually falls to the lot of persons of that class; but by diligent application he became eminent for learning, and attained "to a notable skill in the languages." "The Dutch tongue was almost as vernacular to him as the English; the Latin and the Greek he had mastered; but the Hebrew he most of all studied, "Because," he said, "he would see with his own eyes the ancient oracles of God in their native beauty." He was also well versed in History, in Antiquity, in Philosophy, and in Theology. But the crown of all, was his holy, prayerful, watchful and fruitful walk with God, wherein he was exemplary." [1]

Becoming interested in religion at the early age of twelve, he was soon a regular attendant upon the ministry of Mr. Clifton. Incurring for this the displeasure of his relatives and the scoffs of his neighbors, neither opposition nor scorn could deter him from his course. Joining the church before he was eighteen, he was with it during its exile; and whilst in Holland, he is said by Mather to have learned the art of silk dyeing, of a French Protestant, though we find no confirmation of this statement in earlier writers. On coming of age, his patrimonial estate was sold, and he engaged for a time in commercial pursuits; and though unsuccessful, he philosophically considered "the consumption of his property as sent to prevent a consumption of his virtue." He married in Holland; but his first wife, Dorothy May, was unfortunately drowned at Cape Cod during his absence on a voyage of discovery. To his second wife, Alice, the widow of Constant Southworth, he is said to have been attached in his earlier years, and she came to America in the Anne, in 1623, to join with him her fortunes upon a new scene of action. He died in 1657, and his widow in 1670. His descendants are numerous, and many of them have attained to stations of respectability, honor and usefulness. [2]

[1] Mather, Magnalia, 1. 104–5.

[2] See Mather, 1. 100–05; Belknap's Biog., Art. Bradford; Moore's Gov's of N. Plym. and Mass. &c. &c.

CHAP. II.

1610 to 1617.

Of other members of the Pilgrim Church, we shall have occasion to speak hereafter. It is impossible, at the present day, to state with exactness how many were connected with this Church, either in England or in Holland. No records have descended to us from which a list of their names, or an account of their proceedings can be authentically drawn;[1] and for the want of such knowledge, it is as absurd as it is unnecessary to "forge ancient archives to stretch their lineage back, and to deduce it from the most illustrious houses."[2] Their proudest pedigree is Massachusetts and America. "Si monumentum quæris, circumspice."

[1] The number connected with the church in Holland, is supposed to have been not far from three hundred. Bradford, in Chron. Pil., 455-6; Baylie's, Mem. Plym. Col., 1. 11; Hunter's Founders, 132.

[2] Plutarch's Life of Numa. — Bradford, in Chron. Pil., 456, says: "Many worthy and able men there were in both places, who lived and died in obscurity in respect of the world, as private Christians, yet were they precious in the eyes of the Lord, and also in the eyes of such as knew them."

CHAPTER III.

THE EMIGRATION TO AMERICA.

CHAP. III.

For several years the exiled Pilgrims abode at Leyden in comparative peace. So mutual was the esteem of both pastor and people, that it might be said of them "as of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius and the people of Rome;—it was hard to judge whether he delighted more in having such a people, or they in having such a pastor." With their spiritual, their temporal interests were objects of his care, so that he was "every way as a common father to them." And when removed from them by death, as he was in a few years, they sustained "such a loss as they saw could not be easily repaired, for it was as hard for them to find such another leader and feeder, as the Taborites to find another Ziska."[1]

1617. Eight years residence, however, in a land of strangers, subjected to its trials and burdened with its sorrows, satisfied this little band that Holland could not be for them a permanent home. The "hardness of the place" discouraged their friends from joining them. Premature age was creeping upon the vigorous. Severe toil enfeebled their children. The corruption of the Dutch youth was pernicious in its influence. They were Englishmen, attached to the land of their nativity. The Sabbath, to them a sacred institution, was openly neglected.[2] A suitable education was difficult to be obtained for their children. The truce

[1] Bradford, in Chron. Pil., 36–8; Morton's Mem., 2.

[2] Carleton's Letters, 380; Brandt. Hist. Ref., 3. 28, 290.

with Spain was drawing to a close, and the renewal of hostilities was seriously apprehended. But the motive above all others which prompted their removal, was a "great hope and inward zeal of laying some good foundation for the propagating and advancing of the Gospel of the kingdom of Christ in these remote parts of the world; yea, though they should be but as stepping stones to others for performing of so great a work." [1] CHAP. III. 1617.

For these reasons — and were they frivolous? — a removal was resolved upon. They could not in peace return to England. It was dangerous to remain in the land of their exile. Whither then should they go? Where should an asylum for their children be reared? This question, so vital, was first discussed privately, by the gravest and wisest of the church; then publicly, by all. The "casualties of the seas," the "length of the voyage," the "miseries of the land," the "cruelty of the savages," the "expense of the outfit," the "ill-success of other colonies," and "their own sad experience" in their removal to Holland, were urged as obstacles which must doubtless be encountered. But, as a dissuasive from discouragement, it was remarked that "all great and honorable actions are accompanied with great difficulties, and must be both enterprised and overcome with answerable courages. It was granted the dangers were great, but not invincible; for although there were many of them likely, yet they were not certain. Some of the things they feared might never befal them; others, by providence, care, and the use of good means, might in a great measure be prevented; and all of them, through the help of God, by fortitude and patience might either be borne or overcome." [2]

Whither should they turn their steps? Some, and "none

[1] Bradford, in Chron. Pil., 44–8; Winslow, in ibid., 381–2; Hubbard, 42, 44; Morton's Mem., 3–4.

[2] Bradford, in Chron. Pil., 50.

CHAP. III. 1617.

of the meanest," were "earnest for Guiana." Others, of equal worth, were in favor of Virginia, "where the English had already made entrance and beginning." But a majority were for "living in a distinct body by themselves, though under the general government of Virginia." For Guiana it was said, "the country was rich, fruitful, and blessed with a perpetual spring and a flourishing greenness;" and the Spaniards "had not planted there nor anywhere near the same." Guiana was the El Dorado of the age. Sir Walter Raleigh, its discoverer, had described its tropical voluptuousness in the most captivating terms; and Chapman, the poet, dazzled by its charms exclaims:

> "Guiana, whose rich feet are mines of gold,
> Whose forehead knocks against the roof of stars,
> Stands on her tiptoe at fair England looking,
> Kissing her hands, bowing her mighty breast,
> And every sign of all submission making,
> To be the sister and the daughter both
> Of our most sacred maid."[1]

Is it surprising that the thoughts of the exiles were enraptured in contemplating this beautiful land? Was it criminal to seek a pleasant abode? But as an offset to its advantages, its "grievous diseases" and "noisome impediments" were vividly portrayed; and it was urged that, should they settle there and prosper, the "jealous Spaniard" might displace and expel them, as he had already the French from their settlements in Florida; and this the sooner, as there would be none to protect them, and their own strength was inadequate to cope with so powerful an adversary.

Against settling in Virginia it was urged that, "if they lived among the English there planted, or under their government, they would be in as great danger to be persecuted

[1] Quoted by Dr. Young, in Chron. Pil., 53, note.

for the cause of religion as if they lived in England, and it might be worse; and if they lived too far off, they should have neither succor nor defence from them." Upon the whole, therefore, it was decided to "live in a distinct body by themselves, under the general government of Virginia, and by their agents to sue His Majesty to grant them free liberty, and freedom of religion."[1] CHAP. III.

Accordingly John Carver, one of the deacons of the church, and Robert Cushman, a private member, were sent to England to treat with the Virginia Company for a grant of land, and to solicit of the King liberty of conscience. The friends from whom aid was expected, and to some of whom letters were written, were Sir Edwin Sandys, the distinguished author of the "Europeæ Speculum," Sir Robert Naunton, afterwards Secretary of State, and Sir John Wolstenholme, an eminent merchant, and a farmer of the customs.[2] Sir Ferdinando Gorges seems also to have been interested in their behalf, as he speaks of means used by himself before his rupture with the Virginia Company, to "draw into their enterprises some of those families that had retired into Holland, for scruple of conscience, giving them such freedom and liberty as might stand with their likings."[3] 1617.

The messengers — "God going along with them" — bore a missive signed by the principal members of the church commending them to favor, and conducted their mission with discretion and propriety; but as their instructions were not plenary, they soon returned, bearing a letter from Sir Edwin Sandys[4] approving their dilligence and proffering aid. The next month a second embassy was despatched,[5] with an answer to Sir Edwin's letter, in which, Nov. 12, 1617. Dec. 15, 1617.

[1] Bradford, in Chron. Pil., 52–5; Hubbard, 44–5.

[2] For fuller accounts of these gentlemen, see the valuable notes appended to Dr. Young's Chronicles of the Pilgrims.

[3] Gorges, in 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 73.

[4] This letter is in Young's Chron. Pil., 58, and Hubbard, 46.

[5] Consisting of John Carver, and "S. B." See Chron. Pil., 66–7.

CHAP. III. for his encouragement, the exiles say: "We believe a trust the Lord is with us, ... and will graciously pros our endeavors according to the simplicity of our hea therein. We are well weaned from the delicate milk our mother country, and inured to the difficulties of strange and hard land. The people are, for the body them, industrious and frugal.... We are knit together i a strict and sacred bond and covenant of the Lord, of t violation whereof we make great conscience, and by virtu whereof we hold ourselves strictly tied to all care of other goods.... It is not with us, as with others, whom small things can discourage, or small discontentments cause to wish themselves at home again."[1]

For the information of the Council of the Company, the "requests" of the church were sent, signed by nearly the whole congregation; and in a letter to Sir John Wolstenholme, explanation was given of their "judgments" upon three points named by His Majesty's Privy Council, in which they affirmed that they differed nothing in doctrine, and but little in discipline from the French Reformed Churches, and expressed their willingness to take the Oath of Supremacy, if required, "if that convenient satisfaction be not given by our taking the Oath of Allegiance."[2]

Jan. 27. 1617-8.

The new agents, upon their arrival in England, found the Virginia Company anxious for their emigration to America, and "willing to give them a patent with as ample privileges as they had or could grant to any;" and some of the chief members of the Company "doubted not to obtain their suit of the king for liberty in religion." But the last "proved a harder work than they took it for." Neither James nor his bishops would grant such a request. The "advancement of his dominions," and "the enlargement of the Gospel," his Majesty acknowledged to be "an hon-

[1] Bradford, in Prince, 51–2, and in Chron. Pil., 60–1; Hubbard, 47.

[2] Bradford, in Chron. Pil., 63–5, and Winslow, in ibid., 388–91.

orable motive;" and "fishing" — the secular business they expected to follow — "was an honest trade, the Apostle's own calling;" but for any further liberties, he referred them to the prelates of Canterbury and London. All that could be obtained of the King after the most diligent "sounding," was a verbal promise that "he would connive at them, and not molest them, provided they conducted themselves peaceably: but to allow or tolerate them under his seal," he would not consent.[1] CHAP. III.

With this answer the messengers returned; and their report was discouraging to the hopes of the exiles. Should they trust their Monarch's word, when bitter experience had taught them the ease with which it could be broken? And yet, reasoned some, "his word may be as good as his bond; for if he purposes to injure us, though we have a seal as broad as the house-floor, means will be found to recall or reverse it." In this as in other matters, therefore, they relied upon Providence, trusting that distance would prove as effectual a safeguard as the word of a Prince which had been so often forfeited. May, 1618.

Accordingly other agents were sent,[2] to procure a patent, and to negotiate with such merchants as had expressed a willingness to aid them with funds.[3] On reaching England, these agents found a division existing in the Virginia Company, growing out of difficulties between Sir Thomas Smith and Sir Edwin Sandys; and disagreeable intelligence had been received from Virginia of disturbances in the colony which had there been established. For these reasons, little could be immediately effected. At length, after tedious delays, and "messengers passing to and fro," a patent was Feb., 1618-9.

[1] Bradford, in Prince, 56–7, and in Chron. Pil., 56; Winslow, in Chron. Pil., 382; Morton's Mem., 5; Hubbard, 45.

[2] Robert Cushman, and Wm. Brewster: — not *Bradford*, as in many authors. Mr. Brewster very probably took his family with him at this time, and remained in England until his embarkation for America.

[3] Bradford, in Chron. Pil., 57; Hubbard, 47.

CHAP. III.

obtained, which, by the advice of friends, was taken in the name of John Wincob, a gentleman in the family of the Countess of Lincoln; and with this document, and the pro-

1619. posals of Mr. Thomas Weston, one[1] of the agents returned, and submitted the same to the church for inspection. The nature of these proposals has never transpired, nor is the original patent — the first which the Pilgrims received — known to be in existence. Future inquirers may discover this instrument, as recently other documents have been rescued from oblivion. We should be glad to be acquainted with its terms, were it only to know definitely the region it embraced. But if ever discovered, we will hazard the conjecture that it will be found to cover territory now included in New York.

Upon the reception of the patent and the accompanying proposals, as every enterprise of the Pilgrims began from God, a day of fasting and prayer was appointed to seek divine guidance; and Mr. Robinson, whose services were ever appropriate, discoursed to his flock from the words in

1. Sam., 23: 3, 4. Samuel: "And David's men said unto him, See, we be afraid here in Judah: how much more if we come to Keilah, against the host of the Philistines." Next followed a discussion "as to how many and who should go first." All were ready and anxious to embark; but funds were wanting to defray their expenses. It was concluded, therefore, that the youngest and strongest should be the pioneers of the church, and that the eldest and weakest should follow at a future date. If the Lord "frowned" upon their proceedings, the first emigrants were to return; but if He prospered and favored them, they were to "remember and help over the ancient and poor." As the emigrants proved the minority, it was agreed that the pastor should remain in Holland, and that Mr. Brewster, the Elder, should accompany those who were to

[1] Mr. Cushman. See note 2, p. 69.

leave. Each party was to be an absolute Church in itself; CHAP. III.
and as any went or came, they were to be admitted to fellowship without further testimonies. Thus the Church at Plymouth was the first in New England established upon the basis of Independent Congregationalism.[1]

Early the next spring Mr. Weston visited Leyden to 1620.
conclude the arrangements for "shipping and money;" and Messrs. Carver and Cushman returned with him to England to "receive the money and provide for the voyage." The latter was to tarry in London, and the former was to proceed to Southampton; Mr. Christopher Martin, of Billerrica, in Essex, was to join them; and from the "county of Essex came several others, as also from London and other places."[2]

Pending these negotiations, the property of those who were to embark was sold, and the proceeds were added to the common fund, with which vessels, provisions, and other necessaries were to be obtained. But Mr. Weston already half repented his engagements, and more interested in trade than in religion, he informed his associates that "sundry honorable lords and worthy gentlemen" were treating for a patent for New England, distinct from the Virginia patent, and advised them to alter their plans, and ally with the new Company. At the same time their agents sent word that "some of those who should have gone, fell off, and would not go; other merchants and friends that professed to adventure their money, withdrew, and pretended many excuses; some disliking they went not to Guiana; others would do nothing unless they went to Virginia; and many who were most relied on, refused to adventure if they went thither." Such discouragements would have disheartened men of a less sanguine temperament, and for a time the Pilgrims were "driven to great

[1] Bradford, in Prince, 66; Cotton's Way, 16; Winslow, in Chron. Pil., 383.

[2] Bradford, in Prince, 66.

CHAP. III. 1620.

straits;" but as the Patent for New England had not passed the Seals, it was deemed useless to linger longer in uncertainty, and they "resolved to adventure with that patent they had."[1]

Their greatest hardship was the compact with the merchants. The Pilgrims were poor, and their funds were limited. They had no alternative, therefore, but to associate with others; and, as often happens in such cases, wealth took advantage of their impoverished condition. By their instructions, the terms on which their agents were to engage with the adventurers were definitely fixed, and no alteration was to be made without consultation. But time was precious; the business was urgent; it had already been delayed so long that many were impatient; and to satisfy the Merchants, who drove their bargain sharply and shrewdly, some changes were made, and by ten tight articles the emigrants were bound to them for the term of seven years.[2] At the end of this period, by the original compact, the houses and improved lands were to belong wholly to the planters; and each colonist, having a family to support, was to be allowed two days in each week to labor for their benefit. The last is a liberty enjoyed by "even a Vallachian serf, or a Spanish slave;"[3] and the refusal of the Merchants to grant so reasonable a request caused great complaint; but Mr. Cushman answered peremptorily that, unless they had consented to the change, "the whole design would have fallen to the ground; and necessity having no law, they were constrained to be silent."[4] As it was, it threatened a seven years' check to the pecuniary prosperity of the colony; but as it did not interfere with their civil or religious rights, it was submitted to with the less reluctance, though never acceptable.

[1] Hubbard, 48.

[2] Hubbard, 48–9; Hazard, 1. 87–91; Plym. Col. Laws, 303–4. For an account of the Merchant Adventurers, see Smith's Gen. Hist., 2. 251; and for the names of forty-two of them, see 1 M. H. Coll., 3. 48.

[3] Sumner, in 3 M. H. Coll., 9. 61.

[4] Hubbard, 50.

CHAP. III. 1620.

At this critical juncture, while the Pilgrims were in such perplexity, and surrounded by so many difficulties, the Dutch, who were perfectly acquainted with their proceedings, and who could not but be sensible that the patent they had obtained of the Virginia Company, if sanctioned by the government of England, would interfere seriously with their projected West India Company, and with their settlement at New Netherland, stepped forward with proposals of the most inviting, and apparently disinterested and liberal character. Knowing that but a portion of the church were preparing to embark for America, and that all would be glad to emigrate in a body, overtures were made to Mr. Robinson as pastor, that if he and his flock, and their friends in England, would embark under the auspices of the Lords States General, themselves should be transported to America free of expense, and cattle should be furnished for their subsistence on their arrival. These are the "liberal offers" alluded to in general terms by early Pilgrim writers, and which are uniformly represented as having originated with the Dutch,[1] though recently it has been suggested, and even asserted, that the overtures came from the Pilgrims themselves.[2] But there is an inherent improbability in this last representation, arising from the fact that much time had been spent in procuring a patent in England, and in negotiating with the Adventurers for the requisite funds; and an avowed object with the Pilgrims in leaving Holland was to preserve their nationality. They had no motive, therefore, to originate such a proposition,

[1] See Bradford, in Chron. Pil. 42, and Winslow, in ibid., 385. But the clearest reference we have seen to these offers, is in the Petition of Plymouth, presented to James II., May 30, 1688, in Vol. 7, Mather, MSS.: "We have humbly supplicated," says this Document, "for the confirmation of these lands unto us, whose predecessors out of that innate loyalty engraven on their hearts to their natural prince, could not bear to think of settling themselves and their posterity *under a foreign state, notwithstanding any offers made to them*," &c.

[2] Broadhead's New York, 123-6.

CHAP. III.

though when made to them by the Dutch, it may have proved so attractive, that they were willing to accept it upon certain conditions, of which one was that the government of Holland should guarantee to protect them.

This concession was enough for the merchants to act upon. "They saw at once that so many families going in a body to New Netherland could hardly fail to form a successful colony." But the political part of the question they were unable to decide. "They were ready to expend their capital in carrying the emigrants to New Netherland, and in supplying them with necessaries; but they had no authority to promise that the Dutch government would afford to the colonists special protection after their arrival there." "They therefore determined to apply directly to the general government at the Hague."

The Prince of Orange was then in the zenith of his power; and to him, as stadtholder, the merchants repaired with a memorial, professedly in the name of the "English preacher at Leyden," praying that "the aforesaid preacher and 400 families may be taken under the protection of the United Provinces, and that two ships of war may be sent to secure, provisionally, the said lands to this government, since such lands may be of great importance whenever the West India Company shall be organized."

Feb. 12, 1619-20.

The stadtholder was too wary a politician to approbate immediately so sweeping a proposal, and referred it to the States General. For two months it was before this body, where it was several times discussed; and finally, after repeated deliberations, it was resolved "peremptorily to reject the prayer of the memorialists." Nor can we doubt the wisdom of the policy which prompted this decision. It was well known in Holland that the English claimed the territory of New Netherland. The Dutch had hitherto been tolerated in settling there, because they had not openly interfered with the trade of the English. But should they

Apr. 11, 1620.

now send over a body of English emigrants, under the tri-colored flag, designed to found a colony for the benefit of the Batavian republic, the prudent foresaw that a collision would be inevitable, and might result disastrously to the interests of their nation. Mr. Robinson and his associates, though exiles, were Englishmen, and would be held as such in Holland or in America. Hence, had the Pilgrims emigrated under the auspices of the Dutch, and had James I., demanded of them the allegiance of subjects, they would have been compelled to submit, or the nation which backed them would have been forced into a war. There was wisdom, therefore, in the policy which rejected the memorial of the merchants.

In consequence of the disaffection of Mr. Weston, there were complaints of his delay in providing the necessary shipping; but at last the "Speedwell," of sixty tons — miserable misnomer — was purchased in Holland for the use of the emigrants; and the Mayflower, of one hundred and eighty tons — whose name is immortal — was chartered in England, and was fitting for their reception.[1] The cost of the outfit, including a trading stock of £1,700, was but £2,400: — about $12,000 of the currency of the United States! It marks the poverty of the Pilgrims that their own funds were inadequate to meet such a disbursement; and it marks the narrowness of the Adventurers that they doled the sum so grudgingly, and exacted such securities for their personal indemnity. There were some generous hearts among the members of this company, — true and tried friends of the exiles in their troubles; but many of them were illiberal and selfish, and had very little sympathy with the principles of their partners.[2]

[1] Capt. John Smith says the Speedwell was of 70 tons, and the Mayflower of 160. But we follow the statement of Gov. Bradford.

[2] The truth of this statement will appear more fully, when we treat of the proceedings by which their connection with the Adventurers was dissolved. See Chap. 5.

CHAP. III. 1620.

As the time of departure drew near, a day of public humiliation was observed, — the last that the emigrants kept with their pastor, — and on this memorable occasion Mr. Robinson discoursed to them from the words in Ezra: "And there, at the river, by Ahava, I proclaimed a fast, that we might humble ourselves before God, and seek of him a right way for us, and for our children, and for all of our substance." The catholic advice of this excellent man was worthy to be addressed to the FOUNDERS OF NEW ENGLAND.

Ezra, viii. 21.

"We are now, ere ong, to part asunder; and the Lord only knoweth whether ever I shall live to see your faces again. But, whether the Lord hath appointed this or not, I charge you, before God and his blessed angels, to follow me no further than I have followed Christ; and if God should reveal anything to you by any other instrument of his, be as ready to receive it as ever you were to receive any truth by my ministry; and I am confident that the Lord hath more light and truth yet to break forth out of his holy word. For my part, I cannot but bewail the condition of the Reformed Churches, who are come to a period in religion, and will go no further than the instruments of their reformation. The Lutherans, for example, cannot be drawn to go beyond what Luther saw; and whatever part of God's will he hath further imparted to Calvin, they will rather die than embrace; and so the Calvinists stick where he left them. This is a misery much to be lamented; for though they were precious shining lights in their times, God hath not revealed his whole will to them; and were they now living, they would be as ready and willing to embrace further light, as that they did receive.

"Remember, also, your church covenant, and especially that part of it whereby you promise and covenant with God and one with another, to receive whatsoever light or truth shall be made known to you from his written word. But

take heed what you receive for truth, and examine, compare, and weigh it well with the Scriptures. It is not possible that the Christian world should come so lately out of such thick anti-christian darkness, and that full perfection of knowledge should break forth at once. Shake off, too, the name of Brownists, for it is but a nickname, and a brand to make religion odious, and the professors of it to the Christian world. And be ready to close with the godly party of the kingdom of England, and rather study union than disunion,—how near you may, without sin, close with them, than in the least manner to affect disunion or separation."[1] CHAP. III. 1620.

At the conclusion of this discourse, those who were to leave were feasted at their pastor's house, where, after "tears," warm and gushing from the fulness of their hearts, the song of praise and thanksgiving was raised; and "truly," says an auditor, "it was the sweetest melody that ever mine ears heard."[2] But the parting hour has come! The Speedwell lies at Delfthaven, twenty-two miles South of Leyden; and thither the emigrants are accompanied by their friends, and by others from Amsterdam who are present to pray for the success of their voyage. "So THEY LEFT THAT GOODLY AND PLEASANT CITY, WHICH HAD BEEN THEIR RESTING PLACE NEAR TWELVE YEARS. BUT THEY KNEW THEY WERE PILGRIMS, AND LOOKED NOT MUCH ON THOSE THINGS, AND QUIETED THEIR SPIRITS."

The last night was spent "with little sleep by the most, July 21. but with friendly entertainment and Christian discourse, and other real expressions of true Christian love." On the July 22. morrow[3] they sailed: "and truly doleful was the sight of that sad and mournful parting; to see what sighs and sobs and prayers did sound amongst them; what tears did gush

[1] Winslow, in Chron. Pil., 396–7; Neal's Puritans, 1. 269

[2] Winslow, in Chron. Pil., 384.

[3] Morton and Mather mistake in saying July 2; it was the 22d.

CHAP. III. 1620. from every eye, and pithy speeches pierced each other's hearts; that sundry of the Dutch strangers, that stood on the quay as spectators, could not refrain from tears. Yet comfortable and sweet it was to see such lively and true expressions of dear and unfeigned love. But the tide, which stays for no man, calling them away that were thus loth to depart, their reverend pastor, falling down on his knees, and they all with him, with watery cheeks commended them, with most fervent prayers, to the Lord and his blessing; and then, with mutual embraces, and many tears, they took their leave one of another, which proved to be the LAST LEAVE to many of them."[1]

At starting, they gave their friends "a volley of small shot, and three pieces of ordnance;" and so, "lifting up their hands to each other, and their hearts for each other to the Lord God," they set sail, and found his presence with them "in the midst of the manifold straights he carried them through."[2] Favored by a prosperous gale, they soon reached Southampton, where lay the Mayflower in readiness with the rest of their company; and after a joyful welcome and mutual congratulations, they "fell to parley about their proceedings."[3]

Aug. 5. In about a fortnight the Speedwell, commanded by Capt. Reynolds, and the Mayflower, commanded by Capt. Jones,—both having one hundred and twenty passengers on board,—were ready to set out to cross the Atlantic. Overseers of the provisions and passengers were selected; Mr. Weston and others were present to witness their departure; and the farewell was said to the friends they were to leave. But "not every cloudless morning is followed by a pleasant day." Scarcely had the two barks[4] left the harbor, ere

[1] Bradford, in Prince, 70, and in Chron. Pil., 87–8; Morton's Mem., 5–6,

[2] Winslow, in Chron. Pil., 384. Letters sent to the emigrants by Mr. Robinson, may be seen in Chron. Pil., 89-96, and Morton's Mem.,6-10.

[3] Chron. Pil., 88–9; Morton's Mem.

[4] Gorges, in 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 73, errs in saying they sailed in three ships, of which two proved unserviceable.

Capt. Reynolds complained of the leakiness of the Speedwell, and both put in at Dartmouth for repairs.[1] At the end of eight precious days they started again, but had sailed "only a hundred leagues beyond the land's end," when the former complaints were renewed, and the vessels put in at Plymouth, where, "by the consent of the whole company," the Speedwell was dismissed; and as the Mayflower could accommodate but one hundred passengers, twenty of those who had embarked in the smaller vessel — including Mr. Cushman and his family — were compelled to return; and matters being ordered with reference to this arrangement, "another sad parting took place." CHAP. III. Aug. 13. Aug. 21.

Finally, after the lapse of two more precious weeks, the Mayflower, "freighted with the destinies of a continent," and having on board one hundred passengers, — resolute men, women and children, — "loosed from Plymouth," — "her inmates having been kindly entertained and courteously used by divers friends there dwelling;" — and, with the wind "east-north-east, a fine small gale," was soon far at sea. Sep. 6.

[1] Capt. Jno. Smith, N. Eng. Trials, 13, says "the next day," or Aug. 6; but Prince, 71, says Aug. 13.

[2] The charge of "timidity" and "discouragement" preferred against the twenty who returned, is incorrect. It was by the "consent of the whole" that they tarried behind. In a work published at London, in 1846, from the pen of Samuel, Lord Bp. of Oxford, and entitled a "History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America," I find extracts which purport to be from a MS. Hist. of the Plym. Plant., in the Fulham Library, which, from their similarity to the extracts in Morton and Prince from Gov. Bradford's Hist. of the Colony, I am led to hope may result in the discovery of this long lost, but eminently desirable MS. The following, from p. 62, purporting to be a letter written on board the Speedwell, contains matter which has never before been published in America: — "Our pinass will not cease leaking, els I thinke we had been halfe way at Virginia: our viage hither hath been as full of crosses as ourselves have been of crookedness. We put in here (at Dartmouth) to trimme her; and I thinke if we had stayed at sea but three or four hours more, she would have sunke right downe. She is as open and leakie as a seive; there was a borde a man might have pulled off with his fingers, two foote longe, where the water came in as at a molehole. Our victuals will be half eaten up, I thinke, before we go from the coast of England. I see not how we shall escape even the gasping of hunger-starved persons. Poore W. Kinge and myself doe strive dayly who shall be meate first for the fishes." See further, Appendix, Note A.

CHAP. III.

The particulars of this voyage — more memorable by far than the famed expedition of the Argonauts, and paralleled,
1620. if at all, only by the voyage of Columbus — are few and scanty. Though fair winds wafted the bark onward for a season, contrary winds and fierce storms were soon encountered, by which she was "shrewdly shaken," and her "upper works made very leaky." One of the main beams of the midships was also "bowed and cracked," but a passenger having brought with him "a large iron screw," the beam was replaced, and carefully fastened, and the vessel continued on. During this storm, John Howland, "a stout young man," was, by a "heel of the ship thrown into the sea, but catching by the halliards, which hung overboard, he kept his hold, and was saved." "A profane and proud young seaman," also, "stout and able of body, who had despised the poor-people in their sickness, telling them he hoped to help cast half of them overboard before they came to their journey's end, and to make merry with what they had, was smitten with a grievous disease, of which he died in a desperate manner, and was himself the first thrown overboard, to the astonishment of all his
Nov. 6. fellows." One other death occurred, — that of William Button, a servant to Dr. Fuller; and there was one birth, in the family of Stephen Hopkins, of a son, christened "Oceanus," who died shortly after the landing. The ship being leaky, and the passengers closely stowed, their clothes were constantly wet. This added much to the discomfort of the voyage, and laid the foundation for a portion of the mortality which prevailed the first winter. [1]

"Land ho!" This welcome cry was not heard until
Nov. 9. two months had elapsed, and the sandy cliffs of Cape Cod were the first points which greeted the eyes of the exiles.

[1] Morton's Mem., 10–12; Bradford, in Prince, 72; N. E. Gen. Reg., 1. 48, and 2. 186–8, where are the new facts introduced in the text, furnished by Charles Deane, Esq.

CHAP. III. 1620.

Yet the appearance of these cliffs "much comforted them, and caused them to rejoice together, and praise God, that had given them once again to see land."[1] Their destination, however, was to "the mouth of the Hudson,"[2] and now they were much farther to the north, and within the bounds of the New England Company. They therefore "tacked to stand to the southward," but "becoming entangled among roaring shoals, and the wind shrinking upon them withal, they resolved to bear up again for the Cape," and the next day, "by God's providence, they got into Cape harbor," where, falling upon their knees, they "blessed the Lord, the God of heaven, who had brought them over the vast and furious ocean, and delivered them from all perils and miseries therein, again to set their feet on the firm and stable earth, their proper element."[3]

Morton, in his Memorial, asserts that the Mayflower put in at this Cape, "partly by reason of a storm by which she was forced in, but more especially by the fraudulency and contrivance of the aforesaid Mr. Jones, the master of the ship; for their intention and his engagement was to Hudson's river; but some of the Dutch having notice of their intention, and having thoughts about the same time of erecting a plantation there likewise, they fraudulently hired the said Jones, by delays, while they were in England, and now under the pretence of the sholes, &c., to disappoint them in their going thither. Of this plot betwixt the Dutch and Mr. Jones, I have had *late and certain intelligence*."[4] The explicitness of this assertion has caused the charge of treachery — brought by no one but Morton — to be repeated by almost every historian down to the present period;[5] and it is only within a few years

[1] Mourt's Relat., in Chron. Pil., 117.

[2] Young, Mourt, and Winslow, in Chron. Pil., 102, 117, 385; Dudley's Letter, p. 9, ed. 1696.

[3] Bradford, in Chron. Pil., 103–4.

[4] Morton's Mem., 12.

[5] Hubbard, Mather, Neal, Prince, Hutchinson, Robertson, Belknap, Holmes, Baylies, Graham, Hildreth, &c.

CHAP. III. 1620.

that its correctness has been questioned by writers whose judgment is entitled to respect.[1] But notwithstanding the plausibility of the arguments urged to disprove this charge, and even the explicit assertion that it is a "Parthian calumny," and a "sheer falsehood," we must frankly own that, in our estimation, the veracity of Morton yet remains unimpeached. Facts prove that the Dutch were contemplating the permanent settlement of New Netherland, and the early Pilgrim writers assert that overtures were made to the Leyden church by the merchants of Holland to join them in that movement; and when the petition to the States General presented by those merchants was finally rejected, and the Mayflower commenced her voyage intending to proceed to the Hudson, is it improbable that steps may have been taken to frustrate their intention, and that arrangements may even have been made with the captain of that vessel, by Dutch agents in England, to alter her course, and land the emigrants farther to the North?

We are aware that one[2] to whose judgment we have usually deferred has said, that, had the intelligence been *early* it would have been more certain. But every student of history knows that *late* intelligence is often more reliable and authentic than *early;* and if it be asked, from what source did Morton obtain his information? — we can only suggest that, up to 1664, New Netherland remained under the dominion of the Dutch, and the history of that colony was in a great measure secret to the English. But several of the prominent settlers of Plymouth had ere this removed to Manhattan, — as Isaac Allerton, and Thomas Willet, — and after the reduction of the country and its subjection to England, from these persons the *late* and *certain* intelligence may have been received, or from access to documents which were before kept private.[3]

[1] Moulton, and Brodhead, in their Hist's. of N. York, and Dr. Young, in Chron. Pil.

[2] Young, in Chron. Pil., 102, *note.*

[3] For further remarks on this subject, see Appendix, Note B.

The harbor in which the Mayflower now lay is worthy of a passing glance. It is described by Maj. Grahame, as "one of the finest harbors for ships of war on the whole Atlantic coast. The width and freedom from obstructions of every kind, at its entrance, and the extent of sea-room upon the land side, make it accessible to vessels of the largest class in almost all winds. This advantage, its capacity, depth of water, excellent anchorage, and the complete shelter it affords from all winds, render it one of the most valuable harbors upon our coast, whether considered in a commercial or a military point of view."[1]

If to the advantages here enumerated could have been added a fertile soil, and an extensive back country, suitably furnished with timber and fuel, the spot to which this gallant bark was led would have proved as eligible a site for a flourishing colony as could possibly have been desired. But these advantages were wanting; and though our fathers considered it an "extraordinary blessing of God" in directing their course for these parts, which they were at first inclined to consider "one of the most pleasant, most healthful, and most fruitful parts of the world," longer acquaintance and better information abundantly satisfied them of the insuperable obstacles to agricultural productiveness and commercial importance.[2]

The Pilgrims were now ready to pass to the shore. But before taking this step, as the spot where they lay was without the bounds of their patent, and as signs of insubordination had appeared among their servants, an association was deemed necessary, and an agreement to "combine in one body and to submit to such government and governors as should by common consent" be selected and chosen. Accordingly a compact was prepared, and signed before landing by all the males of the company who were

[1] Exec. Doc., 25 Cong., Sen., 1837-8, No. 121, pp. 2, 13. See also Mourt, in Chron. Pil., 118.

[2] Mourt, in Chron. Pil.

CHAP. III. of age; and this instrument was the constitution of the colony for several years. It was as follows:

1620. "In the name of God, Amen. We whose names are under written, the loyal subjects of our dread sovereign lord, King James, by the Grace of God, of Great Britain France, and Ireland, King, defender of the faith, &c., having undertaken, for the glory of God, and advance ment of the Christian faith, and honor of our King and country, a voyage to plant the first colony in the northern parts of Virginia, do, by these presents, solemnly and mutually, in the presence of God and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together unto a civil body politic, for our better ordering and preservation, and furtherance of the ends aforesaid, and by virtue hereof to enact, constitute and frame, such just and equal laws, ordinances, acts, constitutions, and offices, from time to time, as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the general good of the colony; unto which we promise all due submission and obedience. In witness whereof we have hereunder subscribed our names, at Cape Cod, the 11th of November, in the year of the reign of our sovereign lord, King James, of England, France, and Ireland, the 18th, and of Scotland the 54th, A. D. 1620."[1]

While, on the one hand, much eloquence has been expended in expatiating on this compact, as if in the cabin of the Mayflower had consciously, and for the first time, been discovered in an age of Cimmerian darkness the true principles of republicanism and equality; on the other hand, it has been asserted that the Pilgrims were "actuated by the most daring ambition," and that even at this early period, they designed to erect a government abso-

[1] Mourt, in Chron. Pil., 121; Bradford, in Prince, 84–5; Morton's Mem., 15; Hubbard, 53, 62; Plym. Col. Laws, 18; N. Eng. Gen. Reg., 1. 47–53. The signers were forty-one in number, so that there were probably fifty-nine women and children in the company.

lutely independent of the mother country. But the truth seems to be that, although the form of government adopted by the emigrants is republican in its character, and remarkably liberal, at the same time its founders acknowledged suitable allegiance to England, and regarded themselves as connected with the land of their nativity by political and social ties, both endearing and enduring. Left to themselves in a wilderness land, apart from all foreign aid, and thrown upon their own resources, with none to help or advise, they adopted that course which commended itself to their calm judgment as the simplest and best; and if, under such circumstances, their compact was democratic, it seems chiefly to intimate that self-government is naturally attractive to the mind, and is spontaneously resorted to in emergencies like the present. It is as unwise to flatter our ancestors by ascribing to them motives different from those which themselves professed, as it is unjust to prefer charges against them to which they are not obnoxious. They were honest, sincere, and God-fearing men; humble in their circumstances, and guided by their own judgment; but endowed with no singular prophetic vision, and claiming no preternatural political sagacity. They could penetrate the future no farther than to confide in the justice of God and the power of truth. The latter they knew must ultimately prevail, for the former was pledged to secure its triumph.[1]

CHAP. III. 1620.

The first care of the exiles, having established their provisional government, was to provide for their shelter. Cautiously, therefore, for fear of harm, on the same day that the compact was signed, fifteen or sixteen men, well armed, were set ashore at Long Point to explore the coun- Nov. 11

[1] Comp. Webster's Bi-Cent. Address at Plym., p. 20.—Chalmers, Am., 87, very justly says: "The association itself opposes the admission of reasonings visionary and independent, and recognises England as their country; themselves as subjects; and the King as their sovereign lord."

CHAP. III. try; and returning at night with a boat-load of juniper, which delighted them with its fragrance, they reported that they had found "neither persons nor habitations."

Nov. 12. 1620. The stillness of the Sabbath was consecrated to worship — the first, probably, ever observed by Christians in

Nov. 13. Massachusetts — and on the morrow the shallop was drawn to the beach for repairs, and for the first time the whole company landed for refreshment. As the fitting of the shallop promised to be a difficult task, the adventurous, impatient of delay, were eager to prosecute a journey by land for discovery. "The willingness of the persons was liked, but the thing itself, in regard of the danger, was rather permitted than approved." Consent, however, was obtained, and sixteen were detailed under Capt. Standish,— their military leader, who had served in the armies both of Elizabeth and James,[1] — and Wm. Bradford, Stephen Hopkins, and Edward Tilly, being joined with him as "advisers

Nov. 15. and counsellors," the party debarked at Stevens' Point, at the western extremity of the harbor, and marching in single file, at the distance of about a mile five savages were espied, who, at their approach, hastily fled.

Nov. 16. Compassing the head of East Harbor Creek the next day, and reaching a deep valley, fed with numerous springs, the exhausted travellers, whose provisions consisted but of "biscuit and Holland cheese, with a little bottle of aqua vitæ," eagerly halted by one of these springs, and "drank their first draught of New England water with as much delight as ever they drunk drink in all their lives." Passing thence to the shore, and kindling a beacon-fire, they proceeded to another valley, in Truro, in which was a

[1] For the particulars of his life, see Morton's Mem., Belknap's Biog., Young's Chron. Pilgrims, Winsor's Duxbury, &c., &c. He is supposed to have been born in Lancashire, England, and to have been heir apparent to the estate of the Standishes of Standish Hall; but his early history is involved in some obscurity, and the correctness of these traditions is yet undetermined.

pond, "a musket shot broad and twice as long, near which the Indians had planted corn. Further on graves were discovered; and at another spot the ruins of a house, and heaps of sand filled with corn stored in baskets. With hesitancy — so scrupulous were they of wilfully wronging the natives — an old kettle, a waif from the ruins, was filled with this corn, for which the next summer the owners were remunerated.[1] In the vicinity of the Pamet were the ruins of a fort, or palisade; and encamping for the night near the Pond in Truro, on the following day they returned to the ship, "weary and welcome," and their "Eschol" was added to their diminishing stores.[2] CHAP. III. 1620. Nov. 17.

Ten days after another expedition was fitted out, in which twenty-five of the colonists, and nine or ten of the sailors, with Capt. Jones at their head, were engaged; and visiting the mouth of the Pamet, called by them "Cold Harbor," and obtaining fresh supplies from the aboriginal granaries, after a brief absence, in which a few unimportant discoveries were made, the party returned. Here a discussion ensued. Should they settle at Cold Harbor, or seek a more eligible site? In favor of the former it was urged, that the harbor was suitable for boats if not for ships; the corn land was good; it was convenient to their fishing grounds; the location was healthy; winter was approaching; travelling was dangerous; their provisions were wasting; and the Captain of the Mayflower was anxious to return. On the other hand, it was replied that a better place might be found; it would be a hindrance to remove a second time; good spring water was wanting; and lastly at Agawam, now Ipswich, twenty leagues to the Nov. 27. Nov. 30.

[1] Baylies, Mem., 1. 54, unjustly, as we think, censures this act. In the state in which the Pilgrims then were, we consider it perfectly excusable; and their honesty was evinced by their subsequent conduct.

[2] Mourt, in Chron. Pil., 125–37; Bradford, in Prince, 74–5; Morton, 16–7; Hubbard, 55.

CHAP. III. 1620. north, was an excellent harbor, better ground, and better fishing. Robert Coppin, their pilot, likewise informed them of "a great and navigable river, and good harbor, in the other headland of the bay, almost right over against Cape Cod," which he had formerly visited, and which was called "Thievish Harbor."[1]

Dec. 6. A third expedition therefore was agreed upon; and though the weather was unfavorable, and some difficulty was experienced in clearing Billingsgate point, they reached the weather shore, and there "had better sailing." Yet bitter was the cold, and the spray, as it froze on them, gave them the appearance of being encased in glittering mail. At night their rendezvous was near Great Meadow Creek;

Dec. 8. and early in the morning, after an encounter with the Indians, in which no one was wounded, their journey was resumed,—their destination being the harbor which Coppin had described to them, and which he assured them could be reached in a few hours sailing. Through rain and snow they steered their course; but by the middle of the afternoon a fearful storm raged; the hinges of their rudder were broken; the mast was split, the sail was rent, and the inmates of the shallop were in imminent peril:—yet, by God's mercy, they survived the first shock, and favored by a flood tide steered into the harbor. A glance satisfied the pilot that it was not the place he sought; and in an agony of despair he exclaimed: "Lord be merciful to us! My eyes never saw this place before." In his frenzy he would have run the boat ashore among the breakers; but an intrepid seaman resolutely shouted: "About with her! or we are lost!"—and instantly obeying, with hard rowing, dark as it was, with the wind howling fiercely, and the rain dashing furiously, they shot under the lee of an island, and moored until morning.

Dec. 9. The next day the island was explored—now known as

[1] Morton's Mem., 17–18.

Clarke's Island — and the clothing of the adventurers was carefully dried; but, excusable as it might have been deemed under the circumstances in which they were placed to have immediately resumed their researches, the Sabbath was devoutly and sacredly observed.[1] CHAP. III.

On Monday, Dec. 11th, O. S., a landing was effected upon FOREFATHER'S ROCK. The site of this stone was preserved by tradition, and a venerable cotemporary of several of the Pilgrims, whose head was silvered with the frosts of ninety-five winters, settled the question of its identity in 1741. Borne in his arm-chair by a grateful populace, Elder Faunce took his last look at the spot so endeared to his memory, and bedewing it with tears, he bade it farewell! In 1774, this precious boulder, as if seized with the spirit of that bustling age, was raised from its bed to be consecrated to Liberty, and in the act of its elevation it split in twain! — an occurrence regarded by many as ominous of the separation of the colonies from England — and the lower part being left in the spot where it still lies, the upper part, weighing several tons, was conveyed, amidst the heartiest rejoicings, to liberty-pole square, and adorned with a flag bearing the imperishable motto: "LIBERTY OR DEATH!" On the 4th of July, 1834, the natal day of the freedom of the colonies, this part of the rock was removed to the ground in front of Pilgrim Hall, and there it rests, encircled with a railing, ornamented with heraldic wreaths, bearing the names of the forty-one signers of the compact in the Mayflower. Fragments of this rock are relics in the cabinets of hundreds of our citizens, and are sought with avidity even by strangers as memorials of a pilgrimage to the birth place of New England.[2]

Dec. 11. 1620. 1741. 1774. July 4, 1834.

On the day of the landing the harbor was sounded, and the land was explored; and the place inviting settlement,

[1] Morton's Mem., 19–21.

[2] Davis's Morton, 48, note; Thacher's Plymouth, 29, 198, 199; Dwight's Travels, 2. 110; &c., &c.

CHAP. III. the adventurers returned with tidings of their success; the Mayflower weighed anchor to proceed to the spot; and ere another Sabbath dawned she was safely moored in the desired haven. Monday and Tuesday were spent in exploring tours; and on Wednesday, the 20th, the settlement at Plymouth was commenced, — twenty persons remaining ashore for the night. On the following Saturday the first timber was felled; on Monday their storehouse was commenced; on Thursday preparations were made for the erection of a fort, and allotments of land were made to the families;[1] and on the following Sunday religious worship was performed for the first time in their storehouse.[2]

1620. Dec. 16. Dec. 20. Dec. 23. Dec. 25. Dec. 28. Dec. 31.

For a month the colonists were busily employed. The distance of the vessel — which lay more than a mile from the shore — was a great hindrance to their work; frequent storms interrupted their operations; and by accident their storehouse was destroyed by fire, and their hospital narrowly escaped destruction. The houses were arranged in two rows, on Leyden street, each man building his own. The storehouse was twenty feet square; the size of the private dwellings we have no means of determining. All were constructed of logs, with the interstices filled with sticks and clay; the roofs were covered with thatch; the chimneys were of fragments of wood, plastered with clay; and oiled paper served as a substitute for glass for the inlet of light.[3]

Jan. 14. 1620-1. Feb. 9.

The whole of this first winter was a period of unprecedented hardship and suffering. Mild as was the weather,[4] it was far more severe than that of the land of their birth; and the diseases contracted on shipboard, aggravated by colds caught in their wanderings in quest of a home, caused

[1] The records of this allotment may be seen in Hazard, Young, Baylies, Thacher, Russell, &c.

[2] Bradford, in Prince, 80; Morton's Mem., 22-3.

[3] Young's Chron. Pil.

[4] Dudley's Letter, and Wood's N. E. Prospect, speak of the mildness of this season.

a great and distressing mortality to prevail. In December, six died; in January, eight; in February, seventeen; and in March, thirteen: — a total of forty-four in four months, of whom twenty-one were signers of the compact.[1] It is remarkable that the leaders of the colony were spared. The survivors were unwearied in their attentions to their companions; but affection could not avert the arrows of the Destroyer. The first burial place was on Cole's Hill; and as an affecting proof of the miserable condition of the sufferers, it is said that, knowing they were surrounded by warlike savages, and fearing their losses might be discovered, and advantage be taken of their weakness and helplessness to attack and exterminate them, the sad mounds formed by rude coffins hidden beneath the earth, were carefully leveled and sowed with grain![2] 1621.

However rapidly we have sketched, in the preceding pages, the history of the Pilgrims from their settlement in Holland to their removal to America, no one can fail to have been deeply impressed with the inspiring lessons which that history teaches. As has been well said: "Their banishment to Holland was fortunate; the decline of their little company in the strange land was fortunate; the difficulties which they experienced in getting the royal consent to banish themselves to this wilderness were fortunate; all the tears and heart breakings of that ever memorable parting at Delft-haven had the happiest influence on the rising destinies of New England. All this purified the ranks of the settlers. These rough touches of fortune brushed off the light, uncertain, selfish spirits. They made it a grave, solemn, self-denying expedition, and required of those who were engaged in it to be so too."

Touching also is the story of the "long, cold, dreary

[1] Bradford, in Prince, 95–104; Baylies, 1. 69, 70; Holmes, 1. 168.

[2] Smith, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 27; Hubbard, 57.

CHAP. III. 1621.

autumnal passage," in that "one solitary, adventurous vessel, the Mayflower of a forlorn hope, freighted with the prospects of a future State, and bound across the unknown sea." We behold it "pursuing with a thousand misgivings, the uncertain, the tedious voyage. Suns rise and set, and winter surprises them on the deep, but brings them not the sight of the wished for shore. The awful voice of the storm howls through the rigging. The laboring masts seem straining from their base; the dismal sound of the pumps is heard; the ship leaps, as it were, madly from billow to billow; the ocean breaks, and settles with engulphing floods over the floating deck, and beats with deadening, shivering weight against the staggering vessel." [1]

Escaped from these perils, after a passage of sixty-six days, and subsequent journeyings until the middle of December, they land on the ice-clad rocks of Plymouth, worn out with suffering, weak and weary from the fatigues of the voyage, poorly armed, scantily provisioned, surrounded by barbarians, without prospect of human succor, without the help or favor of their King, with a useless patent, without assurance of liberty in religion, without shelter, and without means!

Yet resolute men are there; — Carver, Bradford, Brewster, Standish, Winslow, Alden, Warren, Hopkins, and others. Female fortitude and resignation are there. Wives and mothers, with dauntless courage and unexampled heroism, have braved all these dangers, shared all these trials, borne all these sorrows, submitted to all these privations. And there, too, is "chilled and shivering childhood, houseless, but for a mother's arms, couchless, but for a mother's breast."

But those sepulchres of the dead! — where lie Turner, Chilton, Crackston, Fletcher, Goodman, Mullins, White, Rogers, Priest, Williams, and their companions, — these

[1] Everett's Plym. Address.

touch the tenderest and holiest chords. Husbands and wives, parents and children, have finished their PILGRIMAGE, and mingled their dust with the dust of New England! Hushed as the unbreathing air, when not a leaf stirs in the mighty forest, was the scene at those graves where the noble and the true were buried in peace. Deeply as they sorrowed at parting with those, doubly endeared to them by the remembrance of what they had suffered together, and by the fellowship of kindred griefs, they committed them to the earth calmly, but with hope. "No sculptured marble, no enduring monument, no honorable inscription," marks the spot where they were laid. Is it surprising that local attachments soon sprung up in the breasts of the survivors, endearing them to the place of their refuge and sorrows? They had come "hither from a land to which they were never to return. Hither they had brought, and here they were to fix, their hopes, and their affections." Consecrated by persecutions in their native land, by an exile in Holland of hardship and toil, by the perils of the ocean voyage and its terrible storms, by their sufferings and wanderings in quest of a home, and by the heart-rending trials of the first lonely winter, — by all these was their new home consecrated and hallowed in their inmost thoughts; and forward to the future they looked, with confidence in God, and a cheerful reliance upon that beneficent Providence which had enabled them with patience to submit to his chastenings, and, Phœnix-like, to rise from the ashes of the dead, and from the depths of the bitterest affliction and distress, with invincible courage, determined to subdue the wilderness before them, and to "fill this region of the great continent, which stretches almost from pole to pole," with freedom and intelligence, the arts and the sciences, flourishing villages, temples of worship, and the numerous blessings of civilized life, baptized in the fountain of the Gospel of Christ.

CHAPTER IV.

INTERCOURSE WITH THE INDIANS.

CHAP. IV.

ALTHOUGH history is silent respecting the early events of the lives of a majority of the Pilgrims, we have reason to think that but few of this band had been regularly trained to the profession of arms, and Standish is the only one who is certainly known to have served as a soldier. Thrown, therefore, upon the inhospitable shores of New England, and surrounded by savages whose enmity they feared, the experience of the first winter impressed them with the necessity of speedy military organization; and before spring dawned, a meeting was held to consult upon measures of defense, and Standish was chosen Captain, and entrusted with "authority of command in affairs." In the midst of their deliberations, two savages appeared upon a neighboring eminence, — the advance guard of a greater body, the clamor of whose voices was heard by those sent to parley with them.[1]

Feb. 17, 1620-1.

Feb. 21. Four days after the ordnance of the colony was mounted; and March being ushered in with warm winds from the south, and the pleasant singing of birds in the woods, about the middle of that month a second military council was convened, and a second aboriginal interruption occurred. A single savage, armed with his bow, marched boldly to their rendezvous, and in broken English bade them, "Welcome!" This was Samoset, the "Sagamore of Moratig-

Mar. 16.

[1] Chron. Pil., 180; Hubbard, 63.

gon."[1] He had learned some English from the crews of the vessels which fished at Monhegan, was a man "free of speech, so far as he could express his mind," and discoursed with them openly "of the whole country, and of each province, and of their Sagamores, and of their number of men and strength." He informed them that Plymouth — their place of abode — was called Patuxet by the natives; that its inhabitants were dead; and that "neither man, woman, or child" was left to dispute their possession. The "Massasoits," or Wampanoags, whose hospitality he was sharing, he represented as "sixty strong;" and the Nausites, who had attacked them in December, as "one hundred strong." CHAP. IV. 1621.

Remaining with them over night, on the morrow he left, promising to return soon with some of the "Massasoits," to trade for beaver; and true to his word, the next day he made his appearance, accompanied by five others, clad in the Indian costume, who "made semblance of friendship, ate liberally of the English victuals, and sang and danced after their manner like antics:" but as it was the Sabbath, their overtures of trade were waived, and they left at nightfall — Samoset only remaining, under pretense of sickness, until the following Wednesday. Mar. 17. Mar. 18

On the day of his departure a third military meeting was held, and a third interruption occurred, — two or three savages appearing on Watson's Hill, "whetting and rubbing their arrows and strings." Resuming their business the next day, they were interrupted a fourth time, by the arrival of Samoset, with four others, one of whom was Tisquantum, or Squanto, who was brought home by Dermer, in 1619.[2] Learning that Massasoit was near by, in about an Mar. 21. Mar. 22.

[1] Possibly the "Somerset" seen by Capt. Levet, in Maine, in 1623. See 3 M. H. Coll., 8. 170. One "Summerset," in 1625, deeded to John Brown a large tract of land in Maine. MSS. in my possession, and Indian deeds. Bancroft mistakes in saying he was of the Wampanoags.

[2] See chap. 1.

CHAP. IV. 1621.

hour he made his appearance, with his brother Quadequina, and about sixty of his warriors. Mutual distrust delayed an interview; but by the mediation of Squanto a hostage was sent them, and Massasoit with twenty of his men crossed the Town Brook, where they were received in military form, escorted to a new building then erecting, presented to Gov. Carver, and after the exchange of friendly salutations, a league of peace — the first of its kind — was concluded, which was preserved inviolable for upwards of fifty years. By its terms, the parties were to abstain from mutual injuries; to make restitution for offenses and deliver up the offenders; to aid and defend each other in the event of external hostilities; and in their interchange of hospitalities arms were to be laid aside. The confederates of Massasoit were to be comprised in this league, and he was requested to inform them of its terms, and to solicit their consent to it. "All which he seemed to like, and at the same time acknowledged himself content to become the subject of King James, and gave unto them and their heirs all the adjacent lands."[1]

Mar. 23. On the day of the departure of Massasoit, the interrupted military arrangements were concluded, several "laws and orders" were passed, and, as they were about entering upon a new civil year, John Carver was unanimously elected Governor of the Colony. Thus four months from the date of the landing at Plymouth, the civil and military organization of the colony was established, and a treaty of peace with the natives was concluded.

Spring having dawned, the attention of the Pilgrims, reduced by sickness and suffering from hunger, was turned to provisions for their future support; and twenty acres of corn and beans were planted, and six acres of barley and peas. In these arduous labors — which were performed

[1] Bradford, in Prince, 99; Mourt, in Chron. Pil., 180–96; Hubbard, 58–9; Morton's Mem., 23–4.

wholly by hand, for neither ploughs nor cattle were then to be found — they were assisted by Tisquantum, who had attached himself to their service, and who taught them the best mode of cultivating and manuring their crops. CHAP. IV. 1621.

We are aware that the claim of a "special providence" attending these exiles, is regarded by many as a relic of superstition, unworthy of credence in the present enlightened age; and it must be admitted, that the doctrine itself is liable to many perversions, and that distorted applications are too often made of it. Yet, guarding ever so cautiously against the influence of imagination, — which should always be kept within rational bounds where history is the theme of discourse,—we must at the same time acknowledge, that we cannot but regard it as a kind interposition in behalf of this feeble band in inclining the hearts of the Indians to peace, and in raising up friends to them among these undisciplined children of the forest. Those who see God only in the stupendous operations of nature, wheeling the planets and guiding the stars, without admitting His presence in its humbler walks, watching the sparrow and providing for the worm, may smile at the recognition of His hand stretched out to these exiles; but for our part, no thought is more cheering than that He, who is greater than the greatest, and God over all, is yet a Father to his children, merciful in His dealings and bountiful in His provisions for their welfare and happiness.

> "One adequate support
> For the calamities of mortal life
> Exists, one only; an assured belief
> That the procession of our fate, howe'er
> Sad or disturbed, is ordered by a Being
> Of Infinite benevolence and power;
> Whose everlasting purposes embrace
> All accidents converting them to good."

The trials of the colonists during the winter had been great; but others were now added which impressed them

CHAP. IV. more fully with a sense of their dependence on God. Hitherto, though distant from the land of their birth, it was possible to return, for the Mayflower yet lay moored at Plymouth. But soon this last link connecting them with

Apr. 5. 1621. the Old World was broken; for early in April, this frail bark, the precious memorial of their wanderings and sufferings, weighed her anchor, hoisted her sails, and, skirting the harbor towards the Gurnet, while the lone Pilgrims crowded the strand watching the lessening speck, gradually vanished from sight, leaving them amidst the solitude of nature, shorn of half their strength, to encounter the mysterious perils of the future! To the honor of these men let it ever be remembered, that not one of their number fainted for weakness, or turned back faltering to the home of his childhood; but, with a loftiness of purpose which was ever theirs, and consecrating themselves anew to the work in which they had engaged, all resolutely remained, determined to abide the direction of God, and calmly to follow the leadings of His hand until summoned from earth to their heavenly home.

Apr. 6. The very day following the departure of the Mayflower one more, and the head of the band, received his summons! Suddenly seized while at work in the field, and deprived of his senses in a few short hours, the spirit of Carver returned to the Giver, and the Pilgrims were bereft of their Governor and friend! But severe as was the shock they were nerved for the worst; and quelling the tumult of emotion in their breasts, a successor was chosen in the person of William Bradford, and to provide for the contingency of his removal by death, Isaac Allerton was chosen his Assistant.[1]

[1] Bradford, in Prince, 104, 105; Morton's Mem., 30–1; Hubbard, 66–7. The latter speaks of Gov. Carver as "a gentleman of singular piety, rare humility, and great condescendency; one also of a public spirit, as well as of a public purse, having disbursed the greater part of that considerable estate God had given him, for the carrying on the interest of the company, as their urgent necessity required." His wife died a few weeks after, of grief at his loss.

CHAP. IV. 1621.

The first public act of the new administration was to fit out an embassy to visit Massasoit, to discover the country, and to strengthen and establish the league which had been formed with him. Stephen Hopkins and Edward Winslow were the persons selected for this purpose, and Tisquantum accompanied them as guide and interpreter. Furnished with "a laced horseman's coat of red cotton" as a present to the monarch, and a signet chain of copper, they set out on Tuesday, at nine in the morning, and reached Namasket, July 3. now Middleborough, at three in the afternoon; and feasting on "maizium, shad-spawn, and roasted acorns," which were luxuries with the natives, they proceeded on, and tarried over night at the fishing wear near Titicut, in Taunton. The next day they passed many places which had been July 4. formerly inhabited, where the bones of the dead lay bleaching upon the ground; and reaching "Packanokick," the residence of Massasoit, they were received as hospitably as his circumstances permitted, though of food his provisions were exceedingly scanty, and his lodgings consisted but of planks, raised a foot from the earth and covered with mats. The poor messengers, tormented with "lice and fleas within doors, and musquitoes without," and with the wild singing of the Indians, lulling themselves to repose, were "worse weary of their lodgings than of their journey;" and, faint from hunger and sleeplessness, the next day found them July 5. exhausted and famishing. "Two fishes like breams, but three times so big," were all that could be furnished for dinner for forty, and this meal only they had "in two nights and a day," so that, "had not one of them brought a partridge, they had taken their journey fasting."

On Friday, before sunrise, they started for home while July 6. they had strength to reach it; and leaving Tisquantum to "truck for them," and taking Tokamahamon, a new ally, they rested for the night at Titicut. About two in the morning, "arose a great storm of wind, rain, lightning, and

CHAP. IV. thunder," by which they were completely drenched; but pushing on, "God be praised, they came safe home that July 7. night, wet, weary, and surbated."[1]

July, 1621. Other expeditions were made during the summer. Sometime in July a party of ten visited Nauset, now Eastham, for the recovery of a son of John Billington, who had wandered five days in the woods, subsisting on berries. Reaching the residence of Iyanough, the Sachem of Cummaquid — now Barnstable — "a man not exceeding twenty-six years of age, personable, gentle, courteous and fair conditioned, indeed, not like a savage save for his attire," they received "an entertainment answerable to his parts, with cheer plentiful and various," and perfected a league of friendship with his tribe.

Departing thence for Nauset, Iyanough accompanied them; and on reaching that place, Aspinet, the Sachem, came forth to meet them, bearing the boy "behung with beads," and "making his peace," they bestowed on him presents, and promised restitution for the corn taken from his granaries the previous winter.[2]

Hearing at Nauset that the Narragansets had seized Massasoit, the adventurers hastened home, where a report was circulating that Corbitant, a petty sachem subject to Massasoit, had raised the standard of revolt. Upon this, Tokamahamon was sent to ascertain the truth of the report, and Tisquantum and Hobomok following him, and being discovered by Corbitant, he beset the house in which they were lodged, and took Tisquantum prisoner; but Hobomok broke from his grasp, and escaped to Plymouth.

Both justice and policy demanded redress; and ten men Aug. 14. were sent to attack Corbitant and his faction, and rescue the prisoners. The day was stormy; but reaching Namasket

[1] Mourt, in Chron. Pil., 204–14; Bradford, in Prince, 106–7; Morton's Mem., 31–2; Hubbard, 67. We follow Prince in the date of this journey, who quotes from Bradford and Morton.

[2] Bradford, in Prince, 107; Mourt, in Chron. Pil., 314–17.

undiscovered, at midnight the assailants rushed upon the wigwams, liberated Tisquantum and Tokamahamon, and made several prisoners: — but Corbitant had fled! Marching the next day into the midst of the town, "thither came all whose hearts were upright," and proclamation was made that, though Corbitant had escaped, "there was no place should secure him and his, if he continued his threatening," and that, if Massasoit returned not safely, or if hereafter Corbitant rebelled against him, or offered him violence, it should be "revenged upon him to the overthrow of him and his."[1] This resolute conduct had the desired effect; and shortly after, a league of peace and submission was drawn up, which was subscribed by nine of the principal sachems, most of whom visited Plymouth with assurances of friendship.[2] CHAP. IV. 1621. Sep. 13.

A few days later a trading expedition was fitted out to the Massachusetts tribe, and Standish, with ten men, were entrusted with its execution. Leaving Plymouth on the floodtide, at midnight, late the next day[3] they reached the "bottom of the bay," probably in the vicinity of the peninsula of Squantum,[4] where they "lay in the shallop." Putting in for the shore in the morning, they landed near a cliff, and placing two sentinels land-ward to secure the shallop, four of the company, and one of the guides, with Standish, went to seek the natives. Meeting a woman at a short distance, she "told them where the people were," and Tis- Sep. 18. Sep. 20.

[1] Bradford, in Prince, 110; Mourt, in Chron. Pil., 219–24; Hubbard, 68. Some of our authorities say fourteen men were sent to Namasket; but we prefer the smaller number, as Standish seldom took more than ten men with him, and besides, there were but nineteen men left in the colony, and it is hardly probable fourteen of them would be absent at once.

[2] This league is in Morton's Mem., 29; Hubbard, 61, 68; Plym. Col. Laws, 305. We are of opinion that all the sachems did not sign at once, but that a part, at least, affixed their names at a later date. See farther on.

[3] Not in the morning, as in Drake's Boston, 44. See Chron. Pil., 224–5.

[4] See the valuable note of Mr. Drake, Hist. Boston, 44, with which we concur.

CHAP. IV. 1621. quantum went to them,— the rest returning to the shallop. The sachem of these parts was "Obbatinewat," whose proper residence was at "Shawmut," now Boston.[1] Being in fear of the Tarratines — a warlike tribe at the Eastward — and at enmity with the "Squaw-sachem" — who lived in his own neighborhood — he "durst not remain in any settled place," and was now a wanderer from his proper abode. Consenting to subscribe the league which others had signed the week before,[2] he accompanied them to visit the squaw-sachem, and they "again crossed the bay," which is described as "large," and as embosoming "at least fifty islands." It was "night"[3] ere they reached Charlestown, and finding no one on shore, the voyagers "rid at anchor aboard the shallop."

Sep. 21. The next day all but two landed, and marched up into the country, passing the late residence of "Nanepashemet," husband of the squaw-sachem, which was "a scaffold largely built, with poles and planks, some six foot from the ground, and the house on that, being situated on the top of a hill."[4] Farther on, in a "bottom," they came to a "fort," of "poles some thirty or forty foot long, stuck in the ground as thick as they could be set one by another," and enclosing a "ring some forty or fifty foot over," with a "trench breast-high digged on each side," and an entrance on one side by a bridge. Within this Nanepashemet lay buried; and a mile farther on was another fort, "on the top of a hill," where he was killed. Near this they held an interview with the natives, who were at first timid, but who gained courage as they found that no harm was intended. Tisquantum, as a requital for this confidence, pro-

[1] Frothingham's Hist. Charlestown, 32.

[2] See note 2, p. 101.

[3] We infer from this expression, that some time was consumed in crossing the bay; and hence it is improbable that the first landing was at Boston, near Copp's hill, as Belknap and Young suggest. See the note of Mr. Drake already referred to.

[4] Said to have been in Medford, on the borders of the Mystic. Lewis's Lynn, 47; Frothingham's Chas'n., 34.

posed to "rifle the salvage women and take their skins," "for," said he, "they are a bad people, and have often threatened you." But Standish indignantly replied: — "Were they never so bad, we would not wrong them, or give them any just occasion against us. For their words, we little weigh them; but if they once attempt anything against us, then will we deal with them far worse than you desire." CHAP. IV. 1621.

Finally, the day being well spent, the party returned to the shallop; and provisions growing scarce, the wind coming fair, and having a light moon, they turned their faces homeward, and before noon on the following day safely arrived, "with a considerable quantity of beaver, and a good report of the place," wishing they had settled there.[1] Sep. 22.

In the fall, the FIRST HARVEST of the colonists was gathered. The "corn" yielded well, and the "barley" was "indifferently good," but the "peas" were a failure, owing to drought and late sowing. Satisfied, however, with the abundance of their fruits, four huntsmen were sent for fowl; and at their return, "after a special manner" the Pilgrims rejoiced together, feasting King Massasoit and ninety men for three days, and partaking of venison, wild-turkeys, water fowl, and other delicacies for which New England was then famous. Thus the time-honored festival of THANKSGIVING was instituted:[2] — a festival, which, originally confined in its observance to the sons of the Pilgrims and the State of Massachusetts, has now become almost a NATIONAL FESTIVAL, peculiarly appropriate as an expression of gratitude to God, and an acknowledgment of dependence upon Him for His bounties, and productive of a treasure of pleasing reminiscences, connected with the joys of our childhood, and the maturer but more exquisite delights of

[1] Bradford, in Prince, 113; Morton's Mem., 32; Hubbard, 68–9, 102.

[2] Bradford, in Prince, 113; Winslow, in Chron. Pil., 231.

CHAP. IV. 1621

our own hearth-sides, where parents and children, brothers and sisters, and all the loved objects of the family group renew, at the festive board, the vows of affection, exchange kind greetings, and revive recollections of the past to enliven the present; while the pilgrimage of life is brightened and sweetened by innocent amusements and healthful recreations, and a sense of obligation to the Giver of all good is implanted more deeply in the heart, sanctifying our trials and enhancing our blessings by a consciousness of the presence and protection of God!

The "village" of Plymouth contained, at this time, seven dwelling houses, and four other buildings for the use of the plantation, and preparations were making for the erection of more.[1] Literally, this was the "day of small things," and most of the events thus far recorded appear trifling in comparison with the stirring narratives of the march of armies, and the conquest of kingdoms. Yet trifling as they seem, they are part of our history, and they derive additional interest from the fact that they were the beginnings of a nation whose career, during the past hundred years, has struck with astonishment the nations of the Old World.

Nov. 9. The Mayflower departed in April, and it was now November. Exactly a year had elapsed since the sandy cliffs of Cape Cod greeted the eyes of her hundred passengers, and within that time what changes had taken place! One half their number were at rest in the grave! The other half had successfully encountered the perils of intercourse with the savages, and had made some progress in civil and domestic affairs. Not a word had they heard from the homes of their infancy! Shut out from the world, and surrounded by the solitude of the primeval forests, alone had they struggled on, with God only to strengthen and support them in their trials!

[1] Prince, 114; Winslow, in Chron. Pil., 230.

On the *anniversary* of their beholding these shores, tidings reached them that there was a ship at Cape Cod! Soon the unknown bark is seen steering for Plymouth! She enters the harbor, and approaches the settlement! Fearing it might be an enemy — for they looked not so soon for supplies — an alarm is sounded! "Every man, yea, every boy that can handle a gun" is armed! And it is bravely resolved, "if she is an enemy, we will fearlessly stand in our just defence."[1] CHAP. IV. 1621. Nov. 9.

But God had provided for them better than they anticipated. So far from being an "enemy," the bark proved to be the "Fortune," of fifty-five tons, bringing thirty-five settlers, all in health. She sailed from London in July, but was detained by cross winds until August, which caused her late arrival. Thrice welcome was the letter she brought from the Merchants, in which they say: — "We have procured you a charter, the best we could, better than the former, with less limitation." This Patent, obtained through the influence of Gorges,[2] was from the Council for New England, and was the *first* grant of territory made by that body; and though in the name of John Pierce, in trust for the colony, and superseded by a later grant, surreptitiously obtained by Pierce for his own benefit, it is still valuable in connection with the early history of the colony. It bears the seals and signatures of the Duke of Lenox, the Marquis of Hamilton, the Earl of Warwick, and Sir Ferdinando Gorges, with another, so obscurely written as to be unintelligible; and though long regarded as lost, it has recently been discovered among the papers of the late Judge Davis, who first gave an abstract of it to the world.[3] It is now published in a permanent form in the invaluable Collections of July 6. 1621 July 1, 1621. Apr. 20, 1622.

[1] Winslow, in Chron. Pil., 234–5; Bradford, in Prince, 114; Morton's Mem., 33; Hubbard, 69.

[2] Gorges, in 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 73.

[3] Davis's Edition of Morton's Memorial, 73, 361–2.

CHAP. IV.

the Massachusetts Historical Society,[1] and is the oldest State paper in existence in Massachusetts.

Dec. 3. 1621.

At the end of a month the Fortune set out on her return, laden with beaver and other skins, and a quantity of clapboards; and as she drew near the English coast, freighted with the fruits of the first years' toil of the struggling colony, she was seized by the French, carried to France, kept there fifteen days, and robbed of all she had worth taking, when she was released, and arrived at London in the following February.[2] Mr. Cushman, who, while at Plymouth, delivered a discourse upon the "sin and danger of self-love," was a passenger in this vessel both ways; and she took letters home from Edward Winslow, William Hilton, and others, and probably the copy of "Bradford's and Winslow's Journal," which was printed in London, in 1622, "for John Bellamie," in a small quarto volume, and which is usually quoted as "Mourt's Relation."[3]

The arrival of the new emigrants was an event in the history of the infant colony; and although it had been thought by the Pilgrims that "there was nothing wanting but company to enjoy the blessings so bountifully bestowed upon them," soon after the departure of the Fortune, her passengers being distributed, and the provisions of the settlement being inspected, the alarming fact was discovered that the supply was hardly sufficient to furnish all with food for six months, even at half-allowance, to which they were reduced. The cause of this scarcity was the outfit of the

[1] See 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 156–63. The valuable notes accompanying this document are from the pen of Charles Deane, Esq., a gentleman than whom few are more conversant with the early history of Massachusetts, and whose well stored library is a treasure of rare works on American History.

[2] Bradford, in Prince, 115; Smith's N. Eng. Trials, 13, and "Pathway," in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 25.

[3] These letters are given by Dr. Young, in his Chronicles of the Pilgrims, 230–8, 250–1; and Mourt's Relation has been re-printed in the Collections of the Mass. Hist. Soc., and by Dr. Young, as above, pp. 109–251.

Fortune for the home voyage; a necessity which, as it was not foreseen, so now it could not be remedied. CHAP. IV.

To increase their anxiety, the Narragansets assumed an attitude of defiance, and a messenger was sent to Plymouth with a bundle of arrows enveloped in a rattle-snake's skin, as an aboriginal war challenge; but Gov. Bradford, without betraying the least fear, stuffed the same skin with powder and balls, and sent word to Canonicus, that if he "desired war rather than peace, he might begin whenever he pleased, they were ready to receive him." This was sufficient! Canonicus dared neither touch the skin, nor suffer it to remain in his house, and it was eventually returned.[1] Jan'y, 1621-2.

Aware, however, of their weakness, the colonists, to provide more effectually for their defense, determined to fortify the town, and the hill which overlooked it, with a stockade, with four jetties without the ordinary circuit of the pale. In three of these gates were placed, which were fastened at night, and guarded in the day time; all able to bear arms were mustered into companies; and a special guard was established, who, in case of an attempt to fire the town, were to surround the endangered place to prevent a surprise.[2] In the following summer, alarmed at the tidings of the massacre in Virginia, a fort was built, with a flat roof or battlement, upon which cannon were mounted; and this fort served, for a time, both for defense, and as a place of resort for public worship.[3] Feb., 1621-2.

While these preparations were making, as it behooved the colonists to prosecute their trading adventures with all diligence, a second expedition "to the Massachusetts" was fitted out; but just as it was ready to start, Hobomok March, 1622.

[1] Winslow, in Chron. Pil., 283; Morton's Mem., 33; Bradford, in Prince, 116; Hubbard, 69, 70.

[2] Morton's Mem., 34; Bradford, in Prince, 117.

[3] Bradford, in Prince, 121; Morton's Mem., 36–7; Hubbard, 70.

CHAP. IV. 1622. informed them of his suspicions that the Narragansets and the Massachusetts were leagued against the English, and that Tisquantum was concerned in the conspiracy, as for some time "whisperings" had been noticed between him and others. Startling as was this intelligence, it was resolved to proceed with the journey; and Standish, taking
Apr. 22. ten men, and Tisquantum and Hobomok for guides, set sail. Before his shallop left the harbor, however, and as it lay becalmed near the Gurnet, a member of Tisquantum's family, covered with blood, came running towards a party "that were from home," and being brought before the Gov ernor, he affirmed that at Namasket were many of the Narragansets, with Massasoit and Corbitant, who designed to take advantage of the absence of Standish to fall upon the town, and that he had been wounded for speaking in their behalf.

Immediately three alarm guns were fired, and the shallop returned. Hobomok, being informed of the story of the savage, pronounced it false, and expressed his willingness to avouch for the fidelity of Massasoit. Yet, as a measure of prudence, his wife was sent privately to Pokanoket for discovery, and finding all quiet, she informed Massasoit of what had occurred, who was highly incensed against Tisquantum, and bade her assure the Governor that "he would send word and give warning when any such business was towards."

After this interlude the voyage was resumed and successfully prosecuted; and on the return of Standish, Massasoit was at Plymouth, expressing his abhorrence of the treachery of Tisquantum; and sending messengers soon after, he demanded his surrender, that he might be put to death. Reluctant to part with so valuable an ally, Governor Bradford urged Massasoit to spare him; but unwilling to forego his revenge, the demand was renewed, the league was referred to in support of the claim, and as an additional

inducement, a quantity of beaver skins were sent as a *douceur*. Here was a dilemma. The propriety of the claim in accordance with the treaty could not be disputed; yet spurning the bribe, the Governor replied that "it was not the custom of the English to sell men's lives at a price, but when they had justly deserved to die, to give them their reward." Tisquantum was accordingly sent for, and his doom seemed inevitable, for Massasoit had furnished the messengers with "his own knife" to cut off the culprit's head. But just as he was about to be delivered into their hands, a boat was espied, which crossed before the town, and disappeared behind a headland; and the Governor availing himself of this incident to justify delay, the messengers, "mad with rage," departed "in great heat," and Tisquantum escaped.[1] CHAP IV.

It was towards the last of May when these events occurred, and the provisions of the colonists were entirely spent. Hence the appearance of the boat excited fears and hopes: — fears lest it should prove to belong to an enemy; hopes that it would prove to belong to their friends. On reaching the shore, it was found to be a shallop from the Sparrow, a fishing vessel then at Damarin's Cove, near Monhegan, sent out by Messrs. Weston and Beauchamp, and bringing six or seven passengers, but no provisions. By a letter from Mr. Weston, they learned that he had wholly withdrawn from the Adventurers, and was purposing to establish a plantation of his own.[2] May, 1622. Jan. 17, 1621-2

As it was of the utmost importance that supplies should be obtained, on the return of this shallop Mr. Edward Winslow was sent to visit the vessels at Monhegan for aid; and by several of the captains he was gratuitously furnished with a sufficiency of bread to allow each person four ounces

[1] Winslow, in Chron. Pil., 290–1; Morton's Mem., 34–5; Hubbard, 71–2.

[2] Bradford, in Prince, 118; Winslow, in Chron. Pil., 293; Hubbard, 72.

CHAP. IV.

per day until harvest. With this he returned; and on reaching Plymouth he found the people much weaker than when he left. Want of bread had abated the strength and flesh of some, and swelled others; and had it not been for shell-fish, dug from the sands, all must have perished. Famine is ever an appalling evil, and imagination recoils at the thought of the horrible condition to which fathers, and mothers, and helpless children might have been reduced, had it not been for even this meagre supply,—enough to drive starvation from the door, but wholly inadequate to satisfy the cravings of appetite. Eked out with muscles and clams, it proved sufficient to sustain them until more could be raised; and we can easily conceive the thankfulness with which it was received, and the diligence with which it was husbanded.[1]

July, 1622.

In July, the condition of the sufferers was slightly improved. Sixty acres of corn were planted in the Spring, and their gardens began to furnish some vegetables for their tables. By the arrival of the Fortune, and with the seven brought in the shallop of the Sparrow, their number was about restored to the original hundred as at the arrival of the Mayflower.[2] All these were to be provided for; and the drain upon their resources was proportionately exhausting. The strange vicissitudes through which they had passed had given them a taste of the privations of a wilderness' life, and they had encountered enough to discourage men of a less resolute temper; yet severe as had been their trials, others were before them far more appalling, and the cup was drained to the dregs ere the occurrence of the crisis which dissolved their connection with the Merchant Adventurers.

July.

One of these trials they were destined to experience from a source least expected. There arrived at Plymouth "two

[1] Morton's Mem., 35; Hubbard, 73–4.

[2] Purchas, in Prince, 120.

ships of Master Weston's," the Charity, of one hundred tons, and the Swan, of thirty, bringing fifty or sixty men, to begin a plantation. The character of these new comers was not such as to win the confidence of the Pilgrims. By the confession of Mr. Weston, many of them are acknowledged to have been "rude and profane fellows;" Mr. Cushman says, "they are no men for us;" Mr. Pierce, not himself overburdened with honesty, thought them "unfit for an honest man's company;" and even Morton of Merry Mount, their principal apologist, says they were "no chosen separatists, but men made choice of at all adventures, fit to have served for the furtherance of Master Weston's undertakings, and that was as much as he need to care for."[1] Indeed, they were mostly adventurers, reckless and unprincipled. A few were honest; but, as a body, they were dissolute, thievish, and ungrateful. The corn of the colonists they shamefully wasted; and all summer long, like so many vampires, they fed upon the life-blood of their hospitable entertainers, requiting their kindness with secret revilings.[2] CHAP. IV. 1622.

The insinuation of Morton that, on their arrival, they were "entertained with court holy bread by the brethren," and "made very welcome in show at least;" and that, jealous of them as hindering their "present practice and future benefit," in the trade for furs, they held anxious "consultation what was best for their advantage, singing the song, *Frustra sapit qui sibi non sapit;*" are to be coupled with his significant admissions that "the good cheer went forward, and the strong liquors walked;" and that "the store of provisions grew short with feasting:"—intimations

[1] Bradford, in Prince, 120; T. Morton, N. Eng. Can., 72, in Force, vol. 2. Comp. Levett, in 3 M. H. Coll., 8. 182; and Dudley's Let., p. 10, ed. 1696.

[2] Winslow, in Chron. Pil., 276, 297; Smith, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 26.

CHAP. IV. 1622.

of their profligacy which all his charges against "the brethren" are insufficient to disguise.[1]

At length the Swan, which had been sent to seek a place for the foundation of the colony, returned and reported in favor of Wessaguscus—now Weymouth—and thither, upon the return of the Charity from Virginia, they went, leaving their sick in the care of Dr. Fuller, who attended them without charge until they were fully recovered. Scarcely, however, had the new colonists arrived at "Old Spain,"[2] ere the Indians complained of them for stealing, and other abuses. The Charity, at her departure in October, left them provisions enough for the winter had they been properly husbanded; but wastefulness and extravagance soon reduced them to want. They were compelled, therefore, to resort to Plymouth for aid, and proposed forming a partnership to trade for corn,—offering the use of the Swan in procuring supplies. This proposition, as the Pilgrims themselves were in want, was cheerfully accepted; and the chief places to which their attention was turned were "to the southward of Cape Cod."

Before anything decisive was accomplished, however, their agent, Mr. Richard Green, the brother-in-law of Weston, died at Plymouth; and Standish, who had twice started on a voyage to the South, was both times driven back by the wind, and was now sick of a violent fever. Thus the

Nov. prosecution of the voyage devolved on Gov Bradford; and taking with him Tisquantum, he went to Monamoycke, now Chatham, where eight hogsheads of corn and beans were obtained. Here, greatly to the loss of the colonists, Tisquantum was seized with a violent fever, and died; and

Nov., 1622. after his decease Gov. Bradford steered for "the Massachu-

[1] N. Eng. Can., 71–2.—Neal, 1. 102, says Weston obtained his patent "under the pretence of propagating the discipline of the Church of England."

[2] See the note in Russell's Guide to Plymouth, 106.

setts," where the complaints against Weston's men were renewed, and where, by reason of a sickness which prevailed, the trade was found to be overthrown. Sailing thence to Nauset, at that place, and at Barnstable, further supplies were obtained; but the shallop being wrecked, Gov. Bradford journeyed overland to Plymouth, and three days after the Swan arrived, her cargo was divided, and she returned to Wessaguscus.[1] CHAP. IV.

Two months later, Standish having recovered, another trip was taken in the Swan to Nauset, the wrecked shallop was recovered, and the corn laden, taken to Plymouth, and divided as before. Subsequently two land journeys were taken by Gov. Bradford to Namasket and Manomet for corn; and the next month Standish went to Mattachiest for supplies, but his boat was frozen in the harbor the first night, and his life endangered by a treacherous plot, from which he escaped only by that singular address and unexampled coolness for which he was ever distinguished.[2] Jan'y, 1622-3. Feb.

Nearly at the same time an Indian messenger arrived from Wessaguscus, bearing a letter from John Sanders, the new agent of the colony, setting forth the miserable condition to which his men were reduced, and the necessity for relief, which must be obtained in some way, even if by violence. Governor Bradford, questioning the messenger, and finding the Indians were scantily supplied as well as Weston's men, wrote Sanders to dissuade him from violence, and exhorted him to live upon *ground nuts* and *clams* as the people of Plymouth were doing. On receiving this letter Sanders came personally to Plymouth, and, at his urgent importunity, though themselves greatly in want, they "spared him corn to carry him to Monhiggon," and thither he went, leaving his associates to shift for them-

[1] Winslow, in Chron. Pil., 299, 302–4; Bradford, in Prince, 124; Morton's Mem., 36, 40.

[2] Winslow, in Chron. Pil., 304–9.

CHAP. IV. 1622-3.

selves. Idleness and riotousness having clothed these prodigal spendthrifts with rags, and brought them to a morsel of bread, they were soon reduced to such straits that some hired themselves as servants to the Indians, "cutting them wood, and fetching them water for a cap full of corn;" others sold all their clothes; others "fell to stealing;" others "starved and died with hunger;" and the rest, deserting their dwellings, became wanderers and outcasts, living upon the coarsest fare, derided by the natives, and treated with contempt. One incident — the hanging of a thief — gave rise to the oft-quoted, but unjust satire of Hudibras on this colony: —

> "Our brethren of New England use
> Choice malefactors to excuse,
> And hang the guiltless in their stead,
> Of whom the churches have less need."[1]

Here, however, we must leave this colony for a short time, to notice other cotemporary events, which preceded their downfall, dispersion, and extinction.

We have already alluded to a journey to Manomet undertaken by Gov. Bradford in February of this year. For the corn then purchased Standish was now sent; and being with two or three men at the house of Caunacum, two of the Massachusetts Indians suddenly entered, one of whom was "Wituwamat," a "notable insulting villain, who had formerly imbrued his hands in the blood of English and French, and had oft boasted of his own valor, and derided their weakness, because, as he said, they died crying, making sour faces, more like children than men." Taking from about his neck a dagger which hung there, he presented it

Mar. 16, 1622-3.

[1] T. Morton, N. Eng. Can., 74–5, was the originator of this story; yet even his account furnishes no ground for the satire, for he does not assert that the vicarious punishment was actually *inflicted*, but only *proposed*. See the valuable note of Mr. Savage, in his second edition of Winthrop's Journal.

to Caunacum, accompanied with a speech, to the effect that the Massachusetts had determined to destroy the colony at Wessagusset, but fearing the vengeance of the Plymouth people, they wished first to increase their strength by enlisting others in their design, and among the rest Caunacum and Iyanough; and as a hopeful beginning, he urged the seizure of Standish. To effect this, it was plotted to entice Standish to send for the rest of his men, on the plea of the coldness of the weather; but suspecting their design he evaded their request, and after a sleepless night left for home, barely escaping a second trap set for him by an Indian of Paomet who accompanied him on his voyage [1]

During his absence, news came to Plymouth that Massasoit was dangerously sick, and that a Dutch ship, driven ashore by stress of weather, lay stranded near his residence. As a mark of attention to the monarch, and to procure an interview with the Dutch,[2] Mr. Edward Winslow was sent to "Pokanokik," with Hobomok for his guide, and John Hampden for his companion, — not the celebrated patriot of that name, as some have supposed, but "a gentleman of London," then wintering at Plymouth.[3] Lodging the first night at Namasket, and crossing the next day at Slade's Ferry, in Swansey, they heard that Massasoit was dead, and was to be buried that afternoon, and that the Dutch ship was afloat and ready to leave.

Hobomok upon this urged an immediate return; but as Corbitant lived near by, and as it would be politic to secure his favor, it was resolved to pay him a visit. On arriving at his residence, it was found that he was absent at Pokanokik; and as they learned that the report of the death of Massasoit was premature, a messenger was hastily des-

[1] Winslow, in Chron. Pil., 309–12, 326.

[2] The favorite resort of the Dutch at this time was at Manomet, within some twenty miles of Plymouth. Brodhead's N. Y., 145.

[3] See Young, in Chron. Pil., 314, *note*.

CHAP. IV. 1622-3.

patched to see if he was living, and finding he was, Mr. Winslow and his companions continued on, and arrived at his house at night. Here a crowd of savages were assembled, in the midst of their charms, making a "hellish noise," and the king was surrounded by women chafing his body to preserve its warmth. Sending all away, Mr. Winslow administered to the sick man a "confection of many comfortable conserves," which afforded instant relief; and continuing his attentions, in a short time his sight was restored, so that he could see his benefactor. Preparing for him the next day "a relishing broth of broken corn, strawberry leaves, and sassafras root," by noon he was quite comfortable; and grateful for the favors he had received, he exclaimed: "Now I see the English are my friends, and love me; and whilst I live, I will never forget this kindness they have showed me."

After visiting others who were sick, and providing further for the refreshment of the king, the party set out for home; and Massasoit, calling Hobomok aside, privately informed him of the plot against the English, and bade him advise the Plymouth people to make a bold move and slay the conspirators before their designs were executed.[1]

Mar. 23. 1622-3.

The twenty-third of March, being the yearly court day, this intelligence was made public; and after some general deliberation, and a private discussion among the principal men, it was concluded to send Standish to Wessagusset, to warn the colonists of their danger, and to seize Wituwamat and the other conspirators. Resolute in all his movements, Standish selected but eight men to accompany him, and on the second day following commenced his voyage, — which

Mar. 24.

was hastened by the arrival of Phineas Pratt directly from

[1] Winslow, in Chron. Pil., 313–26. Hubbard, 77, says that Weston's own men provoked this conspiracy, by informing the Indians that the Governor of Plymouth "was prepared to come and take their corn by force, which made them combine against the English."

Wessagusset, with tidings which confirmed the statements of Massasoit. CHAP. IV.

Proceeding first to Wessagusset, Standish found the ship deserted, and the crew "senseless of their misery," and unsuspicious of the storm which was about to burst upon them. At the plantation a like supineness reigned; and arousing the people to a sense of their danger, yet advising secresy, he directed them what course to pursue, and furnished corn for their wants until the affair was decided. Mar. 25. 1622-3.

The Indians, informed of the arrival of Standish, soon began to flock to the settlement; and one of them, upon his return, reported to his comrades that "he saw by his eye the Captain was angry in his heart," so that they suspected their plot was discovered. Putting on a bold face, however, one Pecksuot, a "pinese, and a notable spirit," came to Hobomok, saying: — "Tell your Captain we know what he has come for, but fear him not, neither will we shun him. Let him begin when he dare, he shall not take us at unawares." Wituwamat also came, and bragged of the excellency of his knife, whose handle was ornamented with the picture of a woman's face. "But," said he," "I have another at home, wherewith I have killed both French and English, and that hath a man's face on it; and by and by these two must marry."

Bearing these taunts with admirable coolness, notwithstanding the alleged hastiness of his temper,[1] Standish waited until Pecksuot, Wituwamat, and two others were together; and a like number of his own men being present, at a given signal the door was closed, and the attack commenced. The contest was fearful. Pecksuot was slain with his own knife by Standish; Wituwamat and another of the Indians were despatched by the rest; and the fourth — a youth of eighteen, the brother of Wituwamat — was taken

[1] Such is Hubbard's charge.

CHAP. IV. 1623.

and hanged. Following up their advantage, other parties were attacked, the whole body of the conspirators was routed, and victory declared in favor of the English. Weston's men, at the conclusion of the struggle, resolved on leaving the place; and a portion of them being furnished with corn sailed for Monhegan, in the Swan, whilst the rest, with Standish — who took with him the head of Wituwamat as a trophy of success — set out for Plymouth.[1] This triumph of the colonists so terrified the allies of the Massachusetts tribe, that "they forsook their houses, running to and fro like men distracted, living in swamps and other desert places, and so brought manifold diseases among themselves, whereof many are dead, as Caunacum of Manomet, Aspinet of Nauset, and Iyanough of Mattakiest."[2]

Such was the beginning and the end of the colony of Weston. Its members, at the outset, "being all lusty men," boasted of the wonders they were to perform, and scoffed at the Plymouth people as fools for bringing with them their *families* to settle in this wilderness. Lord Bacon has complacently observed, that "the best works and of greatest merit for the public, have proceeded from the unmarried or childless men."[3] Weston's colony were of the same opinion. Yet so far were they from prospering in their solitude, that they owed their deliverance to "the colony that had many women, children, and weak ones to support."[4]

A short time subsequent to these events a lonely wanderer, under an assumed name, and dressed as a blacksmith, approaches Monhegan. From thence in a shallop he sets out for a more southerly clime. Cast away near the Merrimac, he barely escapes with his life. Seized by the

[1] Winslow, in Chron. Pil., 332–45. See also T. Morton, N. Eng. Can., 75; Hubbard, 74–9. The benevolent Robinson regretted the necessity which led to this attack, and said: — "Oh that you had converted some before you had killed any."

[2] Winslow, in Chron., Pil., 345.

[3] In Bancroft, 1. 319.

[4] Bradford, in Prince, 132; Morton's Mem., 41–3.

savages, he is stripped to his shirt. Naked and helpless he reaches Piscataqua. Borrowing clothes to cover his shame, he continues his journey. Anon he is at Plymouth. Reduced to beggary he approaches the settlement. So wretched is his garb, and so haggard are his features, that he is at first unrecognized. Yet this is Weston — the Merchant Adventurer — the companion of nobles — the founder of colonies! The "moral" of his history speaks for itself: — "When men are actuated by private interest, and are eager to carry on particular designs of their own, it is the bane of all generous and noble enterprises, and is very often rewarded with dishonor and disadvantage to the undertakers."[1]

[1] Hubbard, 72.

CHAPTER V.

PROGRESS OF THE COLONY.

CHAP. V. 1623.

THE situation of the colonists in the spring of 1623, was peculiarly distressing. By the scantiness of their crops and the prodigality of their neighbors, their granaries were exhausted and they were reduced to want. The narrative of their sufferings is affecting and thrilling. "By the time their corn was planted, their victuals were spent, and they knew not at night where to have a bit in the morning, nor had they corn or bread for three or four months together." Elder Brewster lived upon shell-fish. With only oysters and clams at his meals, he gave thanks that he could "seek of the abundance of the seas, and of treasures hid in the sand." Tradition affirms that at one time there was but a pint of corn left in the settlement, which, being divided, gave to each person a proportion of five kernels. In allusion to this incident, at the bi-centennial celebration, in 1820, when much of the beauty, fashion, wealth, and talent of Massachusetts had congregated at Plymouth, and orators had spoken, and poets sang the praises of the Pilgrims; amidst the richest viands, which had been prepared to gratify the most fastidious epicure to satiety, *five kernels of parched corn* were placed beside each plate, "a simple, but interesting and affecting memorial of the distresses of those heroic and pious men, who won this fair land of plenty, and freedom, and happiness, and yet, at times, were literally in want of a morsel of bread."[1]

Deut., 33: 19.

[1] Bradford, in Prince, 135; Morton's Mem., 44; Hubbard, 79; Baylie's Mem., 1. 121.

To one cause of this distress we have already alluded — the extravagance of Weston's men, who wasted their substance in riotous living. Another was the clause in their compact, by which all that was raised in the colony was placed in a common stock. This wretched arrangement — entered into from necessity and not from choice — was never satisfactory. The indolent, sure of a living, would labor only when compelled to; the willing were discouraged by the severity of their toils. To remedy this evil, a change of policy was introduced, and to each person was alloted, for one year, one acre of ground for his personal benefit, only requiring that a portion of the crop should be deposited at harvest in the common treasury, for the maintenance of government and the support of the gospel. CHAP. V.

In April planting commenced, and the weather held favorable until the last of May. Pleased with the new order of things, cheerfulness and industry prevailed. There was a stimulus to exertion in the hope of individual benefit. Even the women and children labored in the field; more corn than ever was planted; and more life and zeal were displayed.[1] But, though favorable weather forwarded their plants in the earliest of the season, from the third week in May a drought set in, and for six weeks no rain fell, so that the ground was completely parched, and the plants, "both blade and stalk, hung the head and changed the color," and were "judged utterly dead." To add to their distress, they learned of the repulse of a supply, sent by Mr. Pierce, who had now obtained his surreptitious patent, and it was feared that the vessel was wrecked on the coast. At once, therefore, God seemed to have forsaken them. The most resolute faltered, and general despondency prevailed. Even Hobomok was distressed for them. "I fear," April, 1623.

[1] Bradford, in Prince, 133; Winslow, in Chron. Pil., 347; Morton's Mem., 44; Hubbard, 79. Chalmers, Douglas, Robertson, Grahame, and others, mistake in representing the community system as voluntary.

CHAP. V. said he, "they will lose all their corn and starve. The Indians can shift better than the English, for they can get fish." But true greatness yields not to permanent despair. As God only could aid them, a day was appointed to supplicate his favor. It was fair and beautiful. Not a cloud dimmed the horizon. Nine hours they continued in prayer, wrestling for a blessing. Yet brightly the sun shone, and sultry was the air. But towards evening a change was visible, and before morning the rain came, sweetly and gently, yet freely and copiously. "It came without either wind or thunder, and by degrees in that abundance, as that the earth was thoroughly wet and soaked therewith," and the withered corn and other plants speedily revived.

This "rain of liberalities," lasted at intervals for fourteen days, and caused even the Indians to say: "Now we see Englishman's God is a good God; for he hath heard you, and sent you rain; and that without storms, and tempests, and thunder, which usually we have with our rain, which breaks down our corn; but yours stands whole and good still. Surely, your God is a good God." From this time forward the weather continued favorable, and the harvest was "fruitful and liberal to their great comfort and rejoicing; for which mercy, in time convenient, they also solemnized a day of *thanksgiving* unto the Lord."[1]

During this scarcity, Standish was sent to the Eastward for supplies; and succeeding in his mission, on his return he was accompanied by Mr. David Thompson, a Scotchman, who this Spring commenced a plantation "about Piscataqua," now Portsmouth. He is said to have visited America so early as 1619, and to have then purchased the island in Boston harbor which bears his name, though it was not made his residence, nor was it confirmed to him by the gov-

[1] Winslow, in Chron. Pil., 348; Bradford, in Prince, 137; Smith, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 26. Morton, 37–8, errs in placing this drought in 1622.

CHAP. V.

ernment of Massachusetts until some years after;[1] and he now came as the agent of Gorges and Mason, two prominent members of the Council for New England, who, in connection with others, merchants of London, Bristol, Exeter, Plymouth, Dorchester, &c., had purchased the lands known as the Laconia Grant, extending from the Merrimac to the Sagadehoc, and from the Atlantic to the Great Lakes, and the river of Canada. Among his companions were William and Edward Hilton, brothers, of London, who set up their stage at Cocheco, now Dover.[2] Thus were settlements made before 1624 in two at least of the present New England States: — in Massachusetts, at Plymouth; and in New Hampshire, at Dover and Portsmouth; and we have no doubts that there were at the same time permanent settlements in Maine.[3]

August, 1622.

We had occasion, in our first chapter, to allude to the fisheries upon the American coast. In the first quarter of the seventeenth century, this branch of maritime enterprise was prosecuted with great vigor, and hundreds of vessels were annually sent hither from England and other countries. Abuse of the natives, disgusting debaucheries, and personal encounters, in consequence of the lawlessness of the crews, had become quite prevalent; and to such a height had these evils grown, that complaints were made to the New England Council for redress. These complaints prompted to action; and as the King had issued a proclamation forbidding any to approach the northern coast of America without leave, in virtue of their right of unlimited jurisdiction, Capt. Francis West was commissioned as Admiral of New England, with special instructions to restrain

Nov., 1622.

[1] Mass. Recs., 3. 129; Hubbard, 105; Drake's Boston, 35.

[2] Winslow, in Chron. Pil., 350; Prince, 134; Levett, in 3 M. H. Coll., 8. 164; Hutchinson, 1. 100; Hubbard, 214; Belknap's N. H., 1. 8; Williamson's Me., 1. 225.

[3] Gorges, in 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 79; Folsom's Hist. Saco, 24, 201. — Williamson, Hist. Me., 1. 226–8, thinks *permanent* settlements were made in 1622 and 1623.

CHAP. V.

all unlicensed ships, and to exact of all interlopers the tonnage duties imposed by the Council.[1]

1623, May or June.

Arriving on the coast early in the summer,[2] and sailing first to Virginia, at his return he touched at Plymouth, and proceeding to the Eastward entered upon the duties of his office; but finding the fishermen too stubborn to submit to his authority, and the ocean too wide to be under his surveillance, he relinquished the undertaking, discharged his vessel, and left for England. The owners of the vessels with which he had interfered, exasperated at the monstrous assumption of the King, remonstrated with the Council, and laid their grievances before Parliament, coupled with the demand that the obnoxious monopoly should be instantly abrogated, and that the fishing should be free. Two years before, this subject was discussed in Parliament, and the monopoly of the New England Council was loudly complained of; and now that the discussion was renewed,

1624.

Gorges was again called to defend his associates. King James, jealous of his rights, stood upon his prerogative; the Commons denied the validity of his acts, and questioned their constitutionality; and eventually, through the influence of Sir Edward Coke, a bill was passed revoking the odious restrictions, which the King, with his wonted stubbornness, refused to sign. This quarrel was bequeathed by the father to the son, and on the accession of Charles I., was revived, and pursued with determined zeal. Aside from its political consequences, which were highly important, as one of its effects, commercially considered, the fishery at the Banks was suddenly and disastrously checked

[1] Gorges, in 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 70, 74; Smith, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 32; Council's Relat., in 2 M. H. Coll., 9. 19, 20; Hazard, 1. 151–2; Tracts app. to Brereton, in 3 M. H. Coll., 8. 98. — Capt. John Smith, in his New England Trials, gives many curious particulars relative to these fisheries.

[2] Morton and Hubbard say the last of June, in the Paragon; but Winslow, in Chron. Pil., 278, says the last of May, and that he sailed thence to Virginia, and returned in August, and in September, being discharged at Damarin's Cove, the ship again visited Plymouth.

— the number of vessels diminishing, in five years, from four hundred to one hundred and fifty — and in the excitement which prevailed, those merchants who had purchased Monhegan and furnished it with stores, sold their property and withdrew from the business.[1]

July or August, 1623.

About midsummer two more vessels arrived at Plymouth — the Anne, William Pierce, Master, bringing the passengers and goods which were to have been forwarded in the Paragon, the supply ship of Mr. John Pierce; and the Little James, of forty-four tons, Mr. Bridges, Master, which was built for the use of the colony. In both these ships came sixty passengers, all, save one, in good health.[2] On landing, and witnessing the miserable condition of their predecessors, they were daunted and dismayed. Some wished themselves in England again. Others, in the distress of their friends, gaunt with hunger and meanly clad, imagined they saw their own lot pictured. The scene presented a strange mixture of chagrin, sorrow, sympathy, and joy: — chagrin and sorrow, that the circumstances of the colony were so mean and impoverished; sympathy and joy, caused by the meeting of parents and children, husbands and wives, brothers and sisters, after a long and painful separation. It can scarcely be said of the Pilgrims, in providing for the new comers: —

> "They served up salmon, venison, and wild boars
> By hundreds, and by dozens, and by scores;
> Hogsheads of honey, kilderkins of mustard,
> Muttons, and fatted beeves, and bacon swine;
> Herons and bitterns, peacock, swan, and bustards,
> Teal, mallard, pigeons, widgeons, and in fine
> Plum puddings, pancakes, apple pies, and custards:
> And therewithal they drank good generous wine,
> With mead, and ale, and cider of their own."

[1] Hubbard, 84–5; Chalmers Ann., 100–04; Gorges Narr., in 3 M. H. Coll., Vol. 6; U. S. Senate Doc., 22, 1851–2, pp. 219–21.

[2] For their names, see Young, in Chron. Pil., 352. — Mr. Pierce is said to have been twice repulsed in attempting to reach America — the last time with himself and one hundred and nine passengers on board; and in consequence of these misfortunes, he sold his patent — which cost him but £50 — for £500, and the colonists were happily delivered from his power. Winslow, in Chron. Pil., 351; Bradford, in Prince, 139; Hubbard, 81–2; Morton, 45–7, &c.

CHAP. V.

The best dish with which the guests could be entertained was lobster and fish, without bread; and their only drink was cold water from the spring, in the absence of a more stimulating beverage. In the days of Jacob, when the famine was great in Canaan, there were herds of cattle from which some nourishment could be obtained; but the poor Plymouth planters had no herds in their stalls, nor was there an Egypt to flee to for succor in their distress. "All the world" they found "was not oatmeal." Yet they bore these trials with "invincible patience and alacrity of spirit," rejoicing that they were no heavier; and though the freshness of their complexion was abated, "God gave them health."[1]

Sep. 10, 1623.

In September, the Anne returned to London, laden with clapboards and furs, and taking as a passenger Mr. Edward Winslow, deputed as the agent of the colony to transact its business with the Merchant Adventurers; and about the same time the James was equipped for a voyage to the southward of Cape Cod, but owing to the trade of the Dutch in those parts the trip proved profitless. The same vessel was sent to the Eastward in the following March to fish, and was wrecked; but being subsequently recovered and refitted, she was of more service to the colony.[2]

The mission of West to America in the spring of 1623, was part of a plan of colonial government adopted by the Plymouth Council, in the plenitude of its wisdom, which aimed at the establishment of its authority on shore and sea, and in spiritual as in secular affairs; and in the fall of this year[3] there arrived in the Massachusetts Bay, Capt. Robert, the youngest son of Sir Ferdinando Gorges, fresh

Aug. or Sep.

[1] Bradford, in Prince, 140; Morton's Mem., 44; Hubbard, 83; Smith, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 27.

[2] Bradford, in Prince, 140, 145, 147; Winslow, in Chron. Pil., 353.

[3] Gorges, in 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 74, says his son arrived in New England "about the beginning of August;" Hubbard says the "end of August;" but Morton, 43, says the middle of September.

from the Venetian Wars, to act as Lieutenant General of the country, and William Morrell, an Episcopal clergyman of good standing, as superintendent of ecclesiastical affairs. Robert Gorges, in December, 1622, received of the Council a grant of "the Massachusetts," with all the shores and coasts for ten English miles in a straight line towards the north-east, and thirty miles into the main land, through all this breadth; under this grant he was now in the country to effect a settlement; and pitching upon the spot deserted by Weston's men, the new colony was commenced, and storehouses were erected. CHAP. V. 1623.

Notifying Gov. Bradford of his arrival — who was to serve as an assistant in his government — before that gentleman could visit Wessagusset Gorges had sailed for the Eastward in the vessel in which he came; but encountering a storm, he was driven from his course, and put in at Plymouth, where he remained about two weeks. In this interval Weston arrived at Plymouth, and was immediately called to an account by Gorges for the ill-carriage of his colony, and for abuses to Sir F. Gorges and the State, in procuring cannon under false pretenses, and selling them for his own benefit; but through the intervention of Gov. Bradford a reconciliation was effected, and "there was a friendly parting on all hands."[1]

For about a year Gorges labored earnestly for the success of his colony; but his father being involved in disputes with Parliament, and no supplies arriving from England, he was advised to return, which he did, leaving his affairs in the charge of his agents. Mr. Morrell, after his departure, finding few churches to govern, and none anxious to submit to his control, spent a year at Plymouth in peace-

[1] Levett's Voyage, in 3 M. H. Coll., 8. 161, 172; Council's Relat., in 2 M. H. Coll., 9. 22; Morton's Mem., 49, 50; Bradford, in Prince, 141; Gorges, in 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 74–8; Hubbard, 86; Hazard, 1. 152–5.

CHAP. V.

ful scientific inquiries, the results of which he wrought into a Latin poem, which, with its translation, forms part of the first volume of the Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society. Thus the government and the hierarchy, which had been conceived with so much labor, proved fruitless abortions. Gorges "scarcely saluted the country in his office, nor continued in it much longer than Tully's Vigilant Consul, who had not leisure during his whole consulship so much as once to take his sleep;" and Morrell, barely displaying his commission, wisely consigned it to that memorable resting place, "the tomb of the Capulets." "By this experience," says Hubbard, "it appears how great a difference there is between the theoretical and the practical part of an enterprise. The Utopian fancy of any projector may easily in imagination frame a flourishing plantation in such a country as was New England; but to the actual accomplishing thereof, there is required a good number of resolved people, qualified with industry, experience, prudence, and estate, to carry on such a design to perfection, much of which were wanting in the present design."[1]

1623. In the winter of this year we find the first record of the Laws of the Colony, relating to no less important a subject than the right of *trial by jury;* and at the ensuing annual March, 1623-4. meeting four Assistants were added to the government — making five in all — and to the Governor a double vote was given. It was the desire of Gov. Bradford to be excused from further duty, but his services were too valuable to be dispensed with, and he was unanimously re-elected.[2]

March, 1623-4. Nearly at the same time Mr. Winslow, the agent of the Colony, returned from England in the Charity, with a supply of clothing, and a quantity of neat-cattle — the first

[1] Hubbard, 87; Morton's Mem., 52; 1 M. H. Coll., 1. 125–39; Frothingham's Chas'n., 9.

[2] Plym. Col. Laws, 28; Bradford, in Prince, 145; Hubbard, 90–1.

probably ever brought to the shores of Massachusetts. Several letters were forwarded by him, and in particular one from Mr. Cushman — the "right hand" of the colonists with the Adventurers — stating that a "ship carpenter" and a "salter" had been sent to them, — the former of whom proved "honest and industrious," and built two ketches and a lighter, when, in the heat of summer, he sickened and died. The latter was "ignorant and self-willed," and his attempts to manufacture salt, both at Plymouth and at Cape Anne, proved expensive and profitless.[1] CHAP. V. Jan. 24, 1623-4.

The most interesting item in the letter of Mr. Winslow, was the statement that a *patent* had been obtained of lands at Cape Anne, where a fishing stage was erected. This instrument, of which little has been hitherto known, and which was long since regarded as lost, has been recently rescued from the oblivion to which it seemed to have been consigned, and is now published to the world in a permanent and attractive form by a gentleman familiar with the early history of the State.[2] It was executed by Edmond, Lord Sheffeild, a prominent member of the Council for New England, in favor of Robert Cushman and Edward Winslow, of Plymouth, for themselves and their associates. Doubts concerning the authority of the grantor may have early arisen, for which reason, probably, Hubbard calls it a "useless patent." Plymouth it is certain derived no benefit from its possession; yet the Dorchester Adventurers, of whom we shall speak more fully hereafter, who "held under those of New Plymouth," erected a plantation there, Jan. 1, 1623-4.

[1] Bradford, in Prince, 146. Judge Davis, on Morton, 111, thinks the first neat cattle came in the Anne, and Winslow in the same vessel, and he quotes the Plymouth records as his authority; but Prince says Winslow came over in the Charity.

[2] We refer to J. Wingate Thornton, Esq., of Boston, whose neat volume, entitled "The Landing at Cape Anne," is worthy the attention of every student of the history of Massachusetts.

CHAP. V.

which, though relinquished by them as a company, by its removal to Naumkeag under Conant, who never abandoned it, became the germ or seed-plot of the afterwards famous Massachusetts Colony.[1]

One passenger arrived at Plymouth with Mr. Winslow, whose presence proved anything but a blessing to the settlement. This was John Lyford, an Episcopal minister, who seems to have been sent hither by a portion of the Adventurers adverse to the views of the colonists, to whose coming Mr. Cushman and Mr. Winslow were forced to consent to prevent a rupture; and as his advent was the beginning of the series of difficulties which resulted in the dissolution of the connection with the Adventurers, it may be well to glance for a moment at the condition of the colony at this period.

1621. In the fall of 1621, there were, in Plymouth, but seven private and four public buildings; and the number of inhabitants did not much exceed fifty. In the spring of 1624. 1624, the population had increased to one hundred and eighty souls, and the number of dwelling houses was thirty-two. During this interval, not one of the survivors of the Mayflower died. The planters were furnished with a substantial fort, and a pinnace of forty-four tons, with ketches and shallops for trading and fishing. They had a trading house at Nantasket; a fishing stage at Cape Anne; and another was projected on the banks of the Kennebec. Their last harvest was ample, with an overplus for emergencies. Large tracts of land were under cultivation, and enclosures had been made, in which their cattle — including goats, swine, and poultry — were permitted freely to range. Although their pastor was still in Holland, several of their friends from Leyden had joined them, with others from

[1] See the instrument, in Mr. Thornton's "Landing," 31–5, and Comp. 3 M. H. Coll., 8. 180–1.

London. Their temporal circumstances were beginning to be prosperous, and health and peace generally prevailed.[1] CHAP. V.

Only two instances of crime had occurred. John Billington was the first offender, who, for "contempt and opprobrious speeches," was sentenced to punishment, but was forgiven upon humbling himself and sueing for pardon. Edward Dotey, and Edward Leister, had also fought a duel with "sword and dagger," for which they were punished. It is worthy of notice, however, that neither of these persons belonged to Mr. Robinson's Church, but one joined the emigrants in London, and the others were servants to Mr. Stephen Hopkins.[2]

But though peace and prosperity were for a season the portion of the colony, the arrival of Lyford led to disturbances which bore a religious as well as a civil aspect. By the representations of the colonial historians — which must probably be taken with some little allowance — his personal character was not above reproach,[3] and he is censured for his insincerity, and for the hypocrisy of his professions. Yet he was courteously received, admitted to a share in the councils of the government, and joined himself to the church after a "large confession" of his faith and former misconduct. In a very short time, however, he was found plotting with John Oldham, who arrived in the Anne, in 1623; and by his aid, a spirit of disaffection was excited, 1623. and "there was nothing but private whisperings and meetings among them, they feeding themselves and others with what they should bring to pass in England, by the faction of their friends there; which brought others as well as themselves into a fool's paradise."

[1] Smith, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 27. The trading house at the Kennebec was not fully established until the summer of 1628. Bradford, in Prince, 172.

[2] Bradford, in Prince, 103, 105. Billington was executed for murder, in 1630.

[3] See particularly the statement of Gov. Bradford, in Prince, 153; and comp. Morton's Mem., 53, and Hubbard, 91–3.

CHAP. V.

Upon the return of the Charity for England, these gentlemen were noticed to be very busy in preparing letters
July, 1624. to be forwarded to their friends; and Gov. Bradford, having well weighed the propriety of the step, intercepted these letters, and retained a few of the most important for the use of the magistrates, should the factionists attempt to create a disturbance. The plans of Lyford being matured, he soon after withdrew from the Colonial Church, and commenced worshipping apart in the Episcopal form; and deeming it time to check his proceedings, a court was convened, and the charges of the Governor were duly preferred. Both Lyford and Oldham denied his accusations, and defied him to prove them; upon which their letters were produced, and they were confounded. For their "sedition" both were sentenced to banishment, — Oldham, who was the most turbulent, being ordered to depart immediately, though his family were permitted to remain until a home was provided for them; but Lyford had liberty to tarry six months, with the promise of the commutation of his sentence if his repentance proved sincere. It was but a short time, however, before he relapsed; and upon the
August, 1624. departure of the James for England, another letter filled with fresh calumnies was intercepted. For this second offense he was expelled, and went to Nantasket where Oldham was residing.

March, 1625. In the following spring, contrary to the terms which had been imposed, Oldham returned, and behaved with such insolence that he was ignominiously expelled from the colony; but becoming afterwards more moderate in his temper, his misconduct was forgiven, and he became a prominent planter in the Massachusetts Colony.[1] The upshot of this whole affair was without doubt one of those struggles

[1] Morton's Mem., 59; Hubbard, 94–102; Bradford, in Prince, 150–8; T. Morton, N. Eng., Can., 81.— Hubbard states the palliative circumstances in Lyford's case, which he professes to have received from some of his followers.

for the recognition of Episcopacy in the colony, which, a few years later, caused still greater disturbance in Massachusetts, and which are among the unhappy incidents connected with the early history of our State, the offspring of religious zeal and violent sectarian contention. CHAP. V. 1624-5.

Pending the agitation of this controversy, the fame of the plantation at Plymouth, by the publication of several pamphlets relating to its history,[1] had spread through all the West of England; and, as merchants of Bristol had for some years been engaged in the fisheries at "Munhiggon," and others of Dorchester had recently erected stages at Cape Anne, the Rev. Mr. White, a Puritan Minister of the latter town, who was deeply interested in the subject of colonization, enlisted several gentlemen residing in his vicinity, a common stock of £3000 was raised, a trading company was organized, known as the Dorchester Company, and, forming a connection with the grantees of the Sheffeild patent, or receiving an informal consent to settle within its limits,[2] a number of persons were sent to Cape Anne, whose oversight was entrusted for the first year to John Tilly and Thomas Gardiner — the former to superintend the fishing, and the latter the agricultural operations;[3] — and, on the removal of Lyford and Oldham to Nantasket, an invitation was extended to them to join the colony — the one as its minister, and the other to "trade with the Indians." Lyford, whose prospects at Nantasket seem not to have been very flattering,[4] readily accepted this invi-

[1] Bradford's and Winslow's Journal, Cushman's Discourse, and the publications of Capt. John Smith, &c.

[2] See Smith, Gen. Hist., 247; Prince, N. E. Chronol.; Thornton's Landing. The Dorchester Company seems to have been a voluntary association, and unincorporated, though regularly organized, and having officers of its own. Hubbard, 106.

[3] Hubbard, 106. — Prince, 144, quoting from Hubbard, reverses the order of these assignments.

[4] Hubbard, 93. But T. Morton, N. Eng. Can., 81, represents him as prospering in his labors.

CHAP. V.

tation; but Oldham "liked better to stay where he was for awhile, and trade for himself."[1]

In connection with Lyford and Oldham, a similar invitation, at the suggestion of his brother, in England, was extended to Roger Conant, who had voluntarily removed from Plymouth to Nantasket;[2] and this gentleman, who is uniformly spoken of in terms of the highest respect, and commended for his sobriety, prudence and integrity, became the principal stay and superintendent of the settlement; but his history will be more fully noticed in treating of the Massachusetts Colony.

The consequences of the controversy with Lyford were much more important than might be inferred from its cause. The dissatisfaction among the Adventurers, which had for some time been increasing, rose to its height; a rupture occurred; and two-thirds of the members withdrew at once, leaving the colony to shift for itself. A portion of the blame of this rupture is charged, even by the friends of the Pilgrims, to their mismanagement. From a letter, written some months before the breach occurred, we learn that there were complaints of "slothfulness" and "weakness," and a lack of sufficient diligence to increase the stock of the company. But this lack of diligence was the natural result of the terms of the original compact; and it was to remedy this evil that, in 1623, one acre was granted to each person to cultivate for his own benefit; and in 1624 this grant was made permanent. By this new arrangement, fresh zeal was infused into the desponding, and, had it gone on uninterruptedly until the end of seven years, the common stock would doubtless have been largely increased, without detriment to the Merchants, and greatly to the benefit and encouragement of their associates.

Apr. 7, 1624.

[1] Hubbard, 93, 102, 106, 107.

[2] Hubbard, 102. This fact should be carefully noticed. Mr. Conant was not *expelled* from Plymouth, but his removal from thence was *voluntary*.

But if the merchants complained of the colonists, they, in their turn, complained of the merchants, and charged them with inattention to the interests of the colony, and of wasting in "jollity," what should have been employed to liquidate their debts. Probably there was blame on both sides. The connection of the merchants with the colonists was more mercenary than moral; and the connection of the colonists with the merchants was involuntary and profitless. It was one of those cases in which misunderstandings are sure to arise, and from which recriminations inevitably result.[1]

The breach having taken place, there was no disposition on either side to attempt a reconciliation. A few of the Adventurers were friendly to the colonists, and continued to furnish them with goods, sending over "cattle, cloth, hose, shoes, leather, &c.," which were consigned to Messrs. Allerton and Winslow, but with instructions to dispose of them at such exorbitant rates — "seventy per cent. advance" — that their conduct was thought "unreasonable and a great oppression." To settle up these affairs, in the fall of 1625, Capt. Standish was sent to England, with a letter to the Council for New England soliciting their interference, and another to Mr. Cushman pressing a clearance with the Company;[2] but arriving in London when civil commotions disturbed the kingdom, and the plague raged with fearful violence, he found the channels of trade completely choked, and money difficult to be obtained. He succeeded, however, in engaging several of the Council to promise their aid, and in borrowing £150 — though at fifty per cent. interest — with which suitable goods were purchased; and in the following spring he returned, bearing

April, 1626

[1] The papers relating to this controversy are preserved in the Letter Book of Gov. Bradford, 1 M. H. Coll., vol. 3.

[2] 1 M. H. Coll., 3. 36–8. On this voyage, see Hubbard, 95.

CHAP. V.

the mournful intelligence of the death of their pastor, Mr. Robinson, and of their friend Mr. Cushman.[1]

Nov., 1625.

Meanwhile health prevailed at Plymouth, and an abundant harvest was gathered, with the surplus of which a shallop was laden and sent to the Kennebec, under Mr. Winslow, and "some old standards;" and, notwithstanding the lateness of the season, and the unfavorableness of the weather, the voyagers arrived in safety, and obtained seven hundred pounds of beaver in exchange for their corn. As this was the first enterprise of the colonists upon their own account, so it proved an inlet to a further trade, which was greatly beneficial to them afterwards; and, left to their own resources, and "having no other business but trading and planting," they followed these with diligence; and the "trade being retained for the general good, the governor and other managers applied it to the best advantage."[2]

A French ship had been cast away at Sagadehoc sometime before, laden with goods, which fell into the hands of the fishermen at Damarin's Cove; and, as the plantation

1626.

at Monhegan was about being broken up, Mr. Winslow was sent thither to see what purchases could be made. Calling upon Mr. Thompson, at Piscataqua, who was "going on the same design," an arrangement was made with him to buy and share the goods. The "moiety" of the Plymouth people came to £400; and this, with a quantity of French goods, amounting to £100 more, was mostly paid for with the furs which had been collected the previous season, so that the whole proved a successful and profitable investment.[3]

1626.

At the conclusion of harvest, these goods, with their surplus corn, were again traded for furs; and with these they

[1] 1 M. H. Coll., 3. 40; 4 M. H. Coll., 1. 154–5; Bradford, in Prince, 159; Chron. Pil., 478; Hubbard, 96.

[2] Bradford, in Prince, 157, 161.

[3] Bradford, in Prince, 158, 161; Williamson's Me., 1. 232.

paid the £150 borrowed by Capt. Standish, and the remains of some former debts, and purchased a supply of clothing; and, as an agent was needed in England, Mr. Allerton was sent for that purpose, taking with him a bond for such sums as he might borrow for the colony. Upon the whole, therefore, up to this date, the colonists had lost nothing by their rupture with the Adventurers.[1] CHAP. V.

In the ensuing spring, by order of Peter Minuit, Director General, messengers were despatched to Plymouth from the Dutch settlement at Manhattan, with letters "fairly written" in French and Dutch, signed by Isaac De Rasieres, the chief Commissary and Secretary of New Netherland. The Pilgrims had, some years before, learned of the propinquity of these neighbors, but this was their first personal interview with them; and in the letters now brought couched in exceedingly flattering language, and abounding in "over high titles" which seem to have shocked the modesty of the colonists, they were congratulated upon their prosperous and praiseworthy undertaking, and friendship and trade were proffered upon mutually agreeable and profitable terms. To these overtures an obliging reply was returned, in which the Dutch were thanked for their kindness, and a willingness was expressed to accept, at a future date, the offers of trade; but, as the enterprising "schippers" from Manhattan had monopolized nearly all the fur trade at Narraganset and Buzzard's Bay, they were desired to forbear trading in those parts, as they were held to be within the limits of the Plymouth patent. Mar. 9, 1626-7. Mar. 19.

The claim thus set up was far from acceptable to the Dutch authorities, and, in their reply, they asserted their right to the trade, and their intention to defend the same, alleging their authority from the States General and the Prince of Orange. These letters were forwarded to Eng- May, 1627. June 15.

[1] Morton, Hubbard, Prince, &c.

CHAP. V. land for the Plymouth Council, and to that body, and to Sir F. Gorges, was sent an account of the settlement of the Dutch and their proceedings.

Aug. 7, 1627. Two months later, other letters and slight presents were sent by the Dutch to Plymouth; and Gov. Bradford, in Aug. 14 reply, again warned them of the risk they incurred, should the English government take umbrage at their actions; and observed that, though the Dutch claimed twenty-six years possession, the English claimed forty; and suggested that, to prevent misunderstanding, it might be best to solicit the States General to "come to some agreement with England."

Sept., 1627. In the fall of the same year, De Rasieres was sent as an ambassador to the colony; and, sailing in the "barque Nassau," which was freighted with articles of traffic, and "manned with a retinue of soldiers and trumpeters," he Oct. 4. arrived off "Frenchman's Point," now Sandwich, whence a courier was despatched to Plymouth, announcing his presence, and requesting the Governor to furnish him the easiest conveyance to the settlement. In compliance with this request, a boat was sent, in which De Rasieres and the "chief of his company" embarked; and, shortly after, the portly ambassador reached the little village, "honorably attended with the noise of his trumpeters." Here he was entertained several days; his offers of trade were accepted; a quantity of goods were purchased, and "£50 worth of wampumpeack"—the aboriginal currency—which was "the beginning of a profitable trade with the Indians." At his departure, he took with him a letter to Minuit, once more expressing the friendliness of the Pilgrims, yet temperately, but firmly, insisting that the Dutch should "clear the title of their planting in these parts which his Majesty hath, by patent, granted to divers his nobles, and subjects of quality."[1]

[1] Bradford's Letter Book, in 1 M. H. Coll., 3. 51–7; Hubbard, 99, 100; Brodhead's New York, 173–182.

CHAP. V. 1627.

While these events were transpiring, Mr. Allerton, the agent of the colony, returned from England, having borrowed £200, at thirty per cent. interest. By the aid of sundry friends — especially Mr. James Shirley — he had effected a composition with the Adventurers, signed by forty-two of them, a copy of which he brought for inspection. The terms of this compact were, that, for £1800, to be paid at the Royal Exchange every Michælmas, in nine equal annual installments — the first in 1628 — the Company sold to them all their interest in the plantation, including merchandize and lands. Having many other engagements on hand, the colonists were at first doubtful of their ability to bear this additional burden; but the agreement was finally sanctioned, and several of the chief planters entered into bonds for the fulfilment of the contract.

In consequence of this arrangement, a new partnership was formed, into which every head of a family and every prudent young man was admitted; the trade was to be managed as before; and provisions were made for the payment of the debts of the colony, and the division of the neat cattle and lands among the settlers.[1] The success of these negotiations was esteemed a "great mercy," and gave good satisfaction; and such was the impetus given to enterprise, that a new pinnace was built at Manomet, and a house erected, where servants were kept, who planted corn raised swine, and were ever in readiness to go out with the boat. This was the beginning of Sandwich.[2]

As it was the design of the first emigrants to Plymouth to aid the rest of the Leyden church in their removal to America, and as the difficulties with the Merchant Adventurers and the want of funds had alone prevented the

[1] The records of this division are in Baylies, 1. 257–65; Davis's Morton, 376–86; Russell's guide, 134–9. See also Hubbard, 98.

[2] Bradford, in Prince, 167–8; 1 M. H. Coll., 3. 48; 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 28.

CHAP. V. accomplishment of this object, now that the colonists were free to act for themselves, arrangements were immediately made for their reception. Eight of the principal men hired the trade of the colony for the period of six years, for which, with the vessels and merchandize on hand, they assumed debts to the amount of £2400, and agreed to furnish £50 worth of goods annually to the planters, and to sell corn for 6s. per bushel; and, at the end of this time, the trade was to be restored free of charge.

1627. In accordance with this arrangement, Mr. Allerton was once more sent to England, taking with him such furs as had been collected; and he was empowered to bargain with the Adventurers, deliver the bonds, and receive their conveyance. He was also instructed to obtain, if possible, a "patent for the Kennebec," and to interest friends to join with the eight undertakers, for the discharge of the debts of the colony, and the removal of their Leyden friends.

1628. Succeeding in his mission, he returned the following spring, having paid the first installment of £200, and enlisted Messrs. Shirley, Beauchamp, Andrews, and Hatherly, in the trading adventure. He brought, likewise, a patent for the Kennebec, but so ill-bounded that it was necessary the next year to have it enlarged; and an attempt was then made to obtain a new patent for Plymouth itself. Thus the partnership with the Adventurers was dissolved, and the colonists had made safe provisions for the payment of their debts, the prosecution of trade, and the reception of their brethren still resident in Holland. Cheerfulness, animation and industry prevailed; and strong hopes were entertained that the clouds, which had so long lowered upon their prospects, were forever chased away, and that the period of their suffering and struggles was over.[1]

1625 8. Cotemporary with these events, a memorable episode in

[1] Bradford's Letter Book, in 1 M. H. Coll., 3.; Prince, 168, 171, 172.

the history of the colony occurred, of which it is proper we should here give an account. So early as 1625, one Capt. Wollaston — of whom but little is known — accompanied by a few persons of good standing, and a number of servants — in all about thirty[1] — began a plantation on an eminence in Quincy, still known as Mt. Wollaston, not far from the residence of the late President Adams. Among his companions was Thomas Morton, a lawyer, who seems to have first visited America in 1622, and who may have been of Weston's company, which settled at Wessagusset.[2] No mention is made of a patent to Wollaston, nor is it stated from what place his colony came. It was probably a private enterprise, undertaken upon his own responsibility, or he may have been connected with Gorges, the proprietary of those parts. After being seated here a year, Wollaston himself left for Virginia, taking with him part of his servants, and wrote Mr. Rasdall, his partner, to come with another part, appointing Mr. Filcher or Fitcher as his agent, until he or Rasdall should return. 1625.

No sooner was Rasdall gone, than Morton, the chief actor in the ensuing drama, and, at the best, a man of questionable principles, plied the servants with liquor, and excited them to depose Filcher, and set up for themselves. Falling in with his plans, the former agent was driven out, and compelled to seek his bread among his neighbors, and a scene of licentiousness and debauchery commenced, such as these western wilds had never before witnessed. The name of the place was changed to Merry Mount; a May Pole was erected, "with revels and merriment after the old English custom;" and a course of dissipation ensued until the stock of the colony was consumed. Morton became the "Lord of Misrule;" Bacchanalian revelry reigned

[1] Dudley's Let., 10, ed. 1696.

[2] See his N. Eng. Can.—There was a John Wollaston, brother-in-law to Capt. Jno. Mason. Belknap's N. H., 1. 27.

CHAP. V. 1625-8.

triumphant; and around the tall May Pole, decked with garlands, the leader of the party, with his companions, and the dissolute Indian women of the vicinity, like so many Hecates, danced the Saturnalia of wantonness and lewdness.[1] Merry Mount became the school of Atheism, the asylum of the vicious, and the resort of the profligate. It was not the Gerizim of worship,[2] nor the Areopagus of Justice, but the High Place of Baal, the Gilgal of sacrifice. His May Pole was termed "an Idol," the "Calf of Horeb," and the colonists threatened to make it "a woful mount and not a merry mount."

Morton has had his apologists among those who suppose he has been unfairly treated; his "revelries" have been styled "harmless amusements;" and his May Pole, which was destroyed, has been pathetically lamented as "the only one that ever exhilarated New England."[3] And doubtless "mine Host," as he is pleased to term himself, deemed himself justified in his erratic career by the example of King James, who gave orders that, even upon the *Sabbath*, none should be "disturbed or discouraged from dancing, archery, leaping, vaulting, having May games, whitson-ales, morrice dances, *setting up May Poles*, and other sports therewith used, *or any other harmless recreations, on Sundays after divine service.*"[4] Such laxity may have comported with the character of a Prince, in whose presence even women are said to have "reeled in a state of disgusting inebriety,"[5] but, for the honor of the Church of which he was the Head, we would fain hope, that neither his precepts nor his example will be

[1] We derive our account of this colony, not from the ex-parte statements of Gov. Bradford and N. Morton, but from the writings of T. Morton himself; and, if the correctness of our picture is doubted, we refer to his N. Eng. Can., 91, for proof of what we have said.

[2] Yet Morton professed to be a zealous Episcopalian, and to cherish a tender regard for the book of Common Prayer. N. Eng. Can., 9.

[3] Chalmer's Revolt, 1. 40; Haliburton's Rule and Misrule, 30.

[4] King Jame's Book of Sports, 4to, 1618; Prince, N. E. Chronol.

[5] Harrington's Nugæ Antiquæ, in Bancroft, I. 292.

defended at the present day. It may be that the Puritans were too "rigid" in condemning such practices, and it may be that their "morality" was sterner than that of their cotemporaries; but it will reflect little honor upon the Church of England to sanction the proceedings of Morton, or to ascribe to jealousy and hatred of Episcopacy, that which is too evidently chargeable to the hero of Merry Mount. CHAP. V. 1625-8.

In addition to his other malpractices, he began to inveigle servants away, and to sell arms to the natives; and, having taught the latter the use of these weapons, he employed them to hunt for him, and purchased their peltry. With their usual facility and aptness to learn, the savages in a short time became expert marksmen, and passionately devoted themselves to hunting and the chase. Their bows and arrows were cast aside as worthless; and they would buy muskets at any price, if it was possible to obtain them. They were taught, likewise, the use of the pistol and rapier, and the art of moulding balls and repairing defective arms, so that they became formidable antagonists; and, by their superior cunning, agility in racing, and quickness of sight, they were more than a match for a majority of the colonists.

Stimulated by success,—having sold upwards of twenty guns, and one hundred pounds of powder and ball,—Morton sent to England for fresh supplies. But the English, in their scattered settlements, meeting these savages in the woods thus armed, and fearing the evils that might ensue, were alarmed; and, aware that the mischief would spread unless speedily checked, and might become incurable, a meeting of the chief planters was held, and they agreed to solicit the people of Plymouth to join with them to stop Morton's career. The reply of the Pilgrims was, that "they had no authority to do any thing; but seeing it tended to the utter ruin of the whole country, they would join with them against so public a mischief."

An embassy was accordingly sent to admonish Morton of

CHAP. V.

the offense he was giving, and to warn him to desist, as his conduct was contrary to the laws of England; but the messenger was received with oaths and curses. "Proclamations," said Morton, "are no laws, and enforce no penalties. The King is dead, and his displeasure dies with him. I shall trade with the natives despite of your protests." Upon this, Capt. Standish was sent with eight or nine men to arrest him; and on arriving at Merry Mount, Morton armed his companions, heated them with liquor, and putting powder and balls on the table, barred the door. Standish summoned him to surrender; but he scoffed at, and defied him. At length, fearing his house might be forced, he came out, with a great show of courage, as if to an assault; but Standish, fixing that eye upon him before which many a savage had quailed, stepped resolutely up, seized his musket, and dispersing the more turbulent, with Morton as his prisoner he returned to Plymouth.[1]

Here "mine Host" was detained some time — several vessels refusing to take him on board — and at length was sent to England in the custody of John Oldham, with letters to the Council for New England, and to Sir Ferdinando Gorges, setting forth his offenses, which, "on the faith of Christians," they averred to be true; but the artful attorney so well pleaded his own cause, and so poisoned the minds of the Council against the colonists by his "audacious and colored pictures," and his insinuations against their religious principles, that he was set at liberty, and the very next spring, with singular coolness, he returned to Plymouth as the Secretary of Mr. Allerton, — an act on the part of the latter for which he was severely censured.

June 9, 1628.

Soon after his return, being forced to leave the town, the "lord of Merry Mount" resorted to his old haunts. Here

[1] Bradford, in Prince, 175–6, and in 1 M. M. H. Coll., 3. 61; Morton's Mem., 68–72; Hubbard, 104; T. Morton, N. Eng. Can., 93–6.

he was again arrested, under a warrant from the Lord Chief Justice of England, on suspicion of murder. By the Massachusetts Colony, which was then established, he was sentenced to be "set in the bilbowes;"[1] his goods were confiscated for the payment of his debts and the expenses of his transportation; for the "wrongs he had done" his house was burnt down in the sight of the Indians; and he was sent to England, in the Handmaid, to await his trial. On being liberated—for the charge was not proved against him—he became the avowed enemy of the colonies; labored zealously for their overthrow; and finally ended his life in obscurity at Piscataqua. The more sober portion of the colony at Mount Wollaston are said to have remained at the place; and, being joined by others from England, "of a different character," the place "became the seat of an honest, thriving, and sober township."[2]

As it has been recently intimated that no true history of the colony at Mount Wollaston has appeared,[3] we have been careful, in preparing our sketch, to consult as well the writings of Morton himself, as the statements of the Plymouth colonists; and although we may have erred, it is believed that the above account is substantially correct, and is in accordance with facts so far as the same can be now ascertained. The work of Morton is a singular performance. That part of it relating to the customs of the Indians, and

[1] This, according to Hudibras, was

"A Bastile, made to imprison hands,
By strange enchantment made to fetter
The lesser parts and free the greater."

[2] Bradford, in Prince, 193, and in 1 M. H. Coll., 3. 61–4; Dudley's Lett., in Chron. Mass., 321–2; Mass. Records, 1. 75; Josselyn, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 376; Hubbard, 104; Savage's Winthrop, 1. 194, 346–7; T. Morton, N. Eng. Can., 109, 150. It was probably in the fall of 1628 that Mr. Endicott visited Merry Mount, prostrated the May Pole o Morton, and changed the name of the place to Mt. Dagon; and though this act has been censured as an unwarrantable stretch of authority, it should be borne in mind that Morton was but an interloper into the country, and Endicott acted under the authority of the Charter of Charles I., which included the lands upon which this colony was settled.

[3] Drake's Boston.

CHAP. V

the natural history of the country, is interesting and valuable; but the rest abounds in low wit, and that species of lampoonery better befitting a denizen of Billingsgate than a champion of the "honor and dignity of the Episcopal Church." His "seasoning" may be relished by some for its coarseness, but it lacks the true Attic flavor, and is but a miserable attempt to imitate the most execrable and disgusting of the Classic authors, with whose scurrillity, buffoonery and mendacity, he fully sympathized. Were the whole work like a few of its chapters, it would add much to its character, and to the fame of its author; as a more favorable estimate of his moral qualities would be warranted, were not the lack of these qualities so striking and palpable even by his own showing.

1628. In the fall of 1628, Mr. Allerton was again sent to England, as the agent of the colony, to solicit an enlargement of the Kennebec Patent, and a new Patent for Plymouth; but

1629. not succeeding in these objects, in the ensuing fall he was sent once more, and this time with better success; for, after indefatigable labor on his part, and by the help of Mr. Shirley, the Earl of Warwick, and others, he obtained of

Jan. 13 1629-30. the Council for New England a grant, under which the affairs of the colony were conducted for some years. It was the desire of the people to procure a Charter, if possible, and it is said their views were so far seconded, that the Lord Keeper was instructed to give orders to the Lord Solicitor to draw one up in their favor; but, through the jealousy of some of the Massachusetts Colonists,[1] and the opposition of others,[2] their object was defeated, and no Charter was obtained. Hence the colonists were thrown back upon the Patent from the New England Council; and,

[1] "We have some privy enemies in the Bay." Dr. Fuller's Letter to Gov. Bradford, in 1 M. H. Coll., 3. 74.

[2] Even Gorges is said to have interfered with their plans. 1. M. H. Coll., 3. 71.

as this was in the name of William Bradford and his associates,[1] on the 2d of March, 1640, Governor Bradford, with great magnanimity, surrendered the instrument to the people, only reserving to himself three tracts of land, one of which was particularly designed for the benefit of the Indians.[2] 1640.

In 1636, the Laws of the Colony were for the first time revised, the foundation of the government was established on a permanent basis, and the powers of the Governor and Assistants were specifically defined;[3] and in 1638, the powers which had been lodged in the whole body of the freemen, were vested in deputies from the several towns, who assembled in June, 1639, and annually afterwards.[4] The towns settled in this colony before 1643, besides Plymouth, were Duxbury, Scituate, Taunton, Barnstable, Sandwich, and Yarmouth. The progress of settlement was far less rapid here than in the Massachusettss Colony. The Pilgrims were poor, and belonged to the laboring classes. Not blessed with wealth, they were unable to extend their operations with flattering facility. But their poverty was no crime, however great its disadvantages. It fostered a spirit of humility, and was, at the same time, favorable to the development of industry and prudence. Quietly and noiselessly they pursued their way, asserting their rights with dignity and calmness, yet fearlessly and firmly maintaining and defending them. Peaceably disposed, they fomented no quarrels. And there was a simplicity, a freshness, a cordiality, and a whole-heartedness which characterized their course, which were distinguishing qualities in their early history. 1636. 1638. 1639. 1643.

[1] The Patent is in Plym. Col. Laws, 21–6, and Hazard, 1. 298-303. Hubbard and others mistake in saying a Charter was obtained from the King. The Plymouth people never had a Charter.

[2] The Deed of Surrender is in Plym. Col. Laws, 305–7.

[3] Plym. Col. Laws, 36–57.

[4] Plym. Col. Laws, 63.

CHAP. V.

Their legislation was without show, for the community was moral, and a multiplicity of laws was wholly unnecessary. Penalties were annexed to principal offenses, and a few crimes were capital; but the occasions which called for the interference of the magistrates were comparatively rare. Many of their laws were sumptuary; most of them were civil, providing for the allotment of lands, and the management of the fisheries, and consisting of such municipal regulations as are requisite to the safety of every community. The first printed edition of their Statutes, issued in 1671, is exceedingly scarce; so much so that neither Hutchinson, the Historian of the Province, nor Baylies, the Memorialist of the Colony, seem ever to have seen a copy. The author is the fortunate possessor of one of these rarities. We shall have occasion hereafter to speak farther of the legislation of the colony, in the continuance of our sketch.

1671.

As we look back upon the career of the Pilgrims, traced in their annals, we are impressed with the magnitude and the importance of their mission. With no outward pomp, with no gorgeous ceremonies, with no popular applause, with no acclamation of multitudes, was the foundation of their humble settlement laid. Favored by no royal protection did they prosecute their enterprise. For all that was achieved the honor is theirs. And of them may it be truly said, that they laid the corner stone of our beloved Commonwealth, and were instruments, in the hand of God, of initiating that work, which has scattered broad cast over the surface of our country the seeds of great principles, destined, by their development, to confer upon us still greater blessings, and to multiply the fruits which have already abounded, from their unwearied and unmurmuring labors and struggles.

CHAPTER VI.

THE MASSACHUSETTS COLONY.

In the preceding pages, we have sketched the history of the Plymouth, the primitive Colony of our State, from its inception to its peaceful and permanent establishment; and we are now prepared to turn our attention to a similar view of the Massachusetts Colony, which, though subsequent in its origin, and several years the junior, soon took the lead upon the theater of action, and, owing to the superior advantages attending its advent, was more rapid in its growth, and more prosperous in its enterprises. In one respect, both colonies sprung from the same source, religious persecution having ushered them into life, and a desire to rear an asylum, a refuge for the oppressed, dissenting from the views and policy of the Anglican Church, being the groundwork or foundation upon which they were built. But, though both were the offspring of religious persecution, in other respects there was a striking and an inherent distinction in the views, the rank, the talents and the resources of the two; a distinction which, as it marked their beginnings, so it influenced, moulded, and determined their destiny.

The Pilgrims were Separatists, having openly withdrawn from the communion of the National Church. Few of them had been reared in opulence or luxury. Few had enjoyed extensive opportunities for literary culture. Early inured to hardship and toil, unaccustomed to the ease and the refinements of wealth, simple in their habits, and moderate in

CHAP. VI. 1624. to 1626.

their desires, they were eminently fitted as pioneers to New England, preparing the wilderness for the possession and occupancy of succeeding generations. Men of unwavering faith and of exemplary morals, with a profound reverence for God and his word, they were "the servants of posterity," "instruments to break the ice for others," and, though cast into the shade by the success of the second Colony, they are entitled to the honor which springs from true worth, and their magnanimous spirit of self-sacrifice and devotion, will ever endear their memories to all capable of appreciating their virtues and comprehending their excellencies.

The Massachusetts Colonists were Puritans, connected with the National Church, though not fully conforming to its service and ritual. Their ministers were men of standing and influence. Receiving a finished education at the leading universities, their talents, which were conspicuous, were acceptably exercised until their zeal for reform and opposition to ceremonies induced the censure of the bishops and expulsion from their parishes. Of the laity, many were well versed in public affairs, possessed fortunes, accumulated or inherited, and lived in the enjoyment of the external comforts which wealth can command. A few moved in the higher circles of society, bore titles of nobility, and were genuine representatives of the conventional dignity of the mother country. Able of themselves abundantly to furnish both followers and funds, and exempted from the necessity of depending upon others, they could easily equip, not one bark but a fleet, and send, not one hundred but many hundreds, to inhabit the territory selected for their residence. More fortunate than the Pilgrims, who acted worthily their part, their fortune and rank enabled them to obtain what was wanting to the former, — a charter from the crown, with privileges greater than could be derived from a subordinate patent. Hence the

history of the second Colony, though not destitute of incidents of hardship and suffering, is of a stamp very different from that of the first. Its enterprises were prosecuted with vigor and success. Its superior advantages gave it an immediate ascendancy. It stretched out its arms, scattered abroad its means, became the patron of the arts and the sciences, founded seminaries of learning, reared flourishing villages, engaged in commerce, established manufactures, and, taking the lead both in secular and in spiritual affairs, attained to such power and strength that its name became identified with the name of the State. CHAP. VI.

The colony at Plymouth was commenced during the reign of James I., who ascended the throne in 1603, and died in 1625. On the accession of Charles I., who inherited his father's political theories, the government of the National Church, not yet divested of its persecuting spirit, was entrusted to men of arbitrary principles and papistical proclivities. Abbot, the Archbishop of Canterbury, too lenient to subserve the rigorous views of the Court, was suspended from his office, and the notorious Laud,[1] zealous to promote uniformity in religion, became the head of the Church, and the instrument to forward the purposes of the King. From this period, the Monarch surrendered himself to the perversities of his humor, and, with Strafford and Laud as his temporal and spiritual advisers, both in the civil and in the ecclesiastical administration of the realm, a system of insolent invasion of every right most valued by freemen and revered by Protestants was deliberately pursued, with a stubbornness and cruelty which finally exhausted the patience of the people. Three-fourths of the clergy were at this time Calvinists; but Charles and Laud having sympathy with the Arminians, an edict was issued prohibiting the promulgation of the former tenets under the severest penalties; 1603. 1625.

[1] See Burnet's character of Laud, Hist. Own Times, 1. 49.

CHAP. VI.

the Star Chamber and the High Commission, fit engines of despotism, were brought into requisition, and distinguished themselves by a course of such wantonness and barbarity, that the latter, especially, was stigmatized as the Protestant Inquisition. Fines, imprisonment, banishment and the pillory, were the most lenient punishments inflicted by its judges. Its victims were not infrequently condemned to excoriation by the lash of the executioner, the incision of their nostrils, and the excision of their ears, and in this mutilated condition were brutally exhibited as monuments of the "justice of the sovereign, and the piety of the prelates."[1]

1627-8. In civil affairs, the two favorite projects of Charles were, the recovery of the Palatinates from the Emperor and Duke of Bavaria, and the establishment of arbitrary power in his own dominion. To effect the latter, many members of Parliament, then the citadel of Protestantism, were imprisoned for opposing his measures; and the resolution of the King to trample upon the national legislature, and his open approval of the infamous sentiment advanced by one of the clergy, that his royal command in the imposition of loans and taxes obliged the conscience of the subject under pain of eternal damnation, alarmed the fears of the thoughtful, and induced apprehensions of the increase of the persecuting spirit which raged in the Church. Naturally, the question arose, whither should they flee? France, externally embroiled with Austria and England, was internally convulsed by a contest of intense acrimony between Protestants and Catholics. A puissant Protestant league of Holland, Sweden, Saxony and Denmark, waged internecine war with the Emperor of Germany. Sweden was in collision with Poland; Holland with Spain; and every other petty State was drawn into the vortex as inclination

[1] Neal's N. E., 1. 120; Macauly, 1. 83, 91; Grahame, 1. 150–1.

prompted or necessity forced. The whole political horizon was shrouded in gloom, and the prospect of a refuge on any part of the continent was dark and forbidding.[1]

The tendency of these commotions in Church and State, was to call attention more earnestly to the colonization of America; and especially the Puritans, the objects of monarchical vengeance and prelatical rage, turned their eyes hitherwards with eager desire to secure a retreat from the storms of violence which threatened to engulph them in irretrievable ruin. The success of the Plymouth Colony had decided the question of the possibility of supporting a settlement upon these shores; and the hope that here would be none to disturb them in the exercise of their rights, was a powerful inducement to encounter the perils of the ocean, and the miseries of the land, for the tranquil and peaceable enjoyment of these rights.[2]

We have elsewhere referred to the establishment of a colony at Cape Anne, in 1624, by the Dorchester Company, of which Roger Conant was appointed Governor. In the following year, partly from the unprofitableness of the experiment, and partly from the misconduct of a portion of the colonists, this Company was dissolved, the settlement was abandoned, and the planters were paid; but Mr. Conant, who was as dissatisfied with the location as the Adventurers with the business, determined to remove to "a fruitful neck of land" at Naumkeag, now Salem, "secretly conceiving in his mind that in following times it might prove a receptacle for such as upon the account of religion would be willing to begin a foreign plantation in this part of the world, of which he gave intimation to his friends in England."[3] 1624. 1625. 1626.

[1] Hallam, Const. Hist., 238; Prince, N. E. Chronol.; 1 M. H. Coll., 3. 50; Chron. Mass., 274; Macauly, 1. 79–81, 86.

[2] Bradford, in Prince, 161; Parl. Hist. Eng., 9, 69.

[3] Hubbard, 102, 107; Planter's Plea, ed. 1630, chap. 8, or in Force, vol. 2.—Chalmers, Ann., 135, errs in saying Conant emigrated from England in 1626; and Grahame, 1. 151, errs in assigning 1625 as the date of the first settlement at Cape Anne.

CHAP. VI.

The position of this excellent man at Gloucester, where the settlement was first established,[1] was one of as great responsibility, perhaps, as could have been expected under the circumstances; and though the colony of which he was Governor contained, in all, less than fifty persons, and he held his office by appointment from abroad, rather than by the choice of the people, yet, as his colony was the germ of that which afterwards became so famous when known as the Massachusetts Colony, he is entitled to all the honor which such a position could confer, and justice requires that his true position should be defined, and that his services should be neither overlooked, nor entirely forgotten.

The services of Mr. White, the father of this first colony, and, "under God, one of the chief founders of the Massachusetts Colony," should also be held in grateful remembrance; and, unwilling that the work which had been hastily abandoned by his associates should be wholly overthrown, no sooner did he hear of the determination of Mr. Conant, than he wrote him, faithfully promising that if he and three others, John Woodbury, John Balch, and Peter Palfreys,[2] would remain at Naumkeag, he would obtain a patent, and forward men and supplies. This proposition was accepted; but before an answer could be received, the companions of Conant, "for fear of the Indians and other inconveniences," repented their engagement, and inclined to a removal to Virginia with Mr. Lyford. The leader of this little band, however, "as one inspired by some superior instinct, though never so earnestly pressed to go with them, peremptorily declared his mind to wait the providence of God in that place where they now were, yea, though all the rest should forsake him."[3] Finding him thus reso-

[1] Johnson, W. W. Prov., in 2 M. H. Coll, 2. 69; Josselyn, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 376; Thornton's Landing,&c.

[2] Pro'ably others, besides these, remained with Mr. Conant, as there were several "old planters" at Naumkeag when Mr. Endicott arrived. Felt's Salem; Ann. Am. Stat. Ass'n, 1. 138.

[3] Hubbard, 108.

lute, and ashamed of their pusillanimity, the others consented to stay, and Mr. Woodbury was sent to England for supplies. Thus the breath of life was continued in the colony, and Conant and his companions remained "the sentinels of Puritanism on the Bay of Massachusetts."[1] CHAP. VI.

Meanwhile Mr. White, in fulfilment of his promise, enlisted some gentlemen residing "about Dorchester,"[2] who negotiated with the Council, and obtained a patent, conveying to Sir Henry Rosewell, Sir John Young, Thomas Southcote, John Humphrey, John Endicott, and Simon Whetcomb, all "that part of New England lying between three miles to the North of the Merrimac, and three miles to the South of the Charles river, and of every part thereof, in the Massachusetts Bay; and in length between the described breadth, from the Atlantic Ocean to the South Sea."[3] Mar. 19. 1627-8.

A considerable portion of the land embraced in this patent, had been previously granted by the same Council to Capt. John Mason, and to Robert, the son of Sir Ferdinando Gorges; and the grounds upon which it was now re-sold do not appear. The enemies of the patentees, indeed, alleged that the new grant was "surreptitiously" obtained;[4] but Sir Ferdinando Gorges himself disclaims this charge;[5] the colonists successfully exposed its falsity;[6] and though some recent writers have seen fit to revive it,[7] Chalmers, who was none too favorable to the Puritans, frankly admits that it is without foundation.[8] 1621-2. 1623.

But whatever may have been the reasons for this second

[1] Conant's Deposition, in Mass. Archives, Towns, 1. 217; Mather's Mag., 1. 62; Bancroft's U. S., 1. 339.

[2] Not *of* Dorchester, as in Bancroft, 1. 330.

[3] Hubbard, 108; Hutchinson, 1. 16; Mather, 1. 62; Josselyn, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 326-7; Dudley's Lett., 11. ed. 1696.

[4] Hazard, 1. 391; Petition of R. Mason, in Belknap's N. H., 1. App. p. xviii.

[5] Gorges, in 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 80.

[6] Answer to Mason's Petition, in Belknap's N. H., 1. App. No. xiv.

[7] Haliburton's Rule and Misrule.

[8] Polit. Ann., 147.

CHAP. VI. 1628.

sale,— whether some of the former grants were themselves invalid,[1] or were forfeited by non-use;[2] or whether the grantors were ignorant of the geography of the country, or were principally anxious to increase the emoluments of their Company;[3] or whether compromises were made with the former proprietors,[4]— the patent itself, from its interference with those of a previous date, gave rise to perplexing embarrassments, and to controversies, which were conducted with no little acrimony, and which continued to disturb the country for over half a century.

A patent being obtained, a portion of the grantees were soon satisfied that, to transport a colony to so distant a clime, and to maintain it for years, was an enterprise which did not promise to be immediately profitable, and, discouraged by this circumstance, their zeal speedily abated; but, through the influence of Mr. White, himself invincible to all opposition, several merchants of London and "other religious persons" were persuaded to become partners in the adventure;[5] and the first three of the original patentees withdrawing, the rest purchased or assumed their rights, formed a company afterwards known as the Massachusetts Company, and organized by choosing Matthew Cradock, for Governor, and Thomas Goffe, for Deputy Governor, with a board of Assistants, who were the chief officers of the Company after its incorporation under the Royal Charter.

In compliance with the promise to Mr. Conant, one of the first acts of this Company, with its ample resources, was to seek a suitable person to conduct a body of emi-

[1] Decl'n of Mass. Col., in Belknap's N. H. 1. App. p. xxvi.

[2] Answer to Mason, in Belknap, 1. App. p. xxxviii; Hutchinson, 1. 16.

[3] Hubbard's Narr. Ind. Wars, p. 2, ed. 1676.

[4] Hubbard, Hist. N. E., 226; Hutch. Coll., 423; Belknap's N. H., 1. 15, note.

[5] Hubbard and Mather say Winthrop and Dudley now joined the Company; but as their names are not found in the list of Adventurers in 1628, we incline to the opinion that they joined at a later date, perhaps early in 1629.

grants to the settlement at Naumkeag, "to carry on the Plantation of the Dorchester agents, and to make way for the settling of another colony in the Massachusetts;[1] and they selected for this purpose one of their own number — John Endicott, Esq., a Puritan of the sternest mould[2] — who manifested much willingness to accept of the offer as soon as it was tendered, and who was appointed Agent or Governor of the Plantation "until themselves should come ever,"[3] his instructions being signed by fourteen of the Company.[4] May 30, 1628.

Preparations for his departure were promptly made, and about the last of June, he embarked in the Abigail, Henry Gauden, Master, accompanied by his wife and children, "the hostages of his fixed attachment to the new world."[5] The number of persons who went with him is not certainly known; but we have reason to think that it did not exceed if it amounted to fifty; for the same year, a body of servants was sent to join him at Salem, and these, with his own company, and the "old planters" under Conant, are said to have made, in all, a body of but about one hundred persons.[6] These servants, "arriving in an uncultivated desert, for want of wholesome diet and convenient lodgings, were many of them seized with the scurvy and other distempers, which shortened their days, and prevented the rest from performing any great matter of labor that year for advancing the work of the plantation." Being destitute June, 1628.

[1] Hubbard, 109, and Narr., 4.

[2] Johnson, W. W. Prov., in 2. M. H. Coll., 2. 69.

[3] Hubbard, 109, is explict on this point; and it appears, from his language, that a part of the company, at least, were at this time, contemplating a removal to America, though that object was not accomplished until 1630. See also pp. 114, 115 of ibid.

[4] See their names in Hutchinson, 1. 16, *note*.

[5] Hubbard, 109; Bancroft, 1. 341.

[6] Planters Plea, 43, in Force, vol. 2, and in Chron. Pil., p. 13; Hubbard, 110, 115. Those who came with Mr. Endicott, joined to Conant's party, made a body of about sixty persons; and the names of ten who remained with Conant are certainly known.

CHAP. VI

of a physician, Dr. Fuller of Plymouth went to their relief; and in his interview with Mr. Endicott, the religious view of the Pilgrims were discussed, which led to a correspondence between Mr. Endicott and Govenor Bradford, then personally strangers, and a friendship commenced which lasted till death.[1]

Up to this date, the Massachusetts Company was guided in its operations solely by the patent from the Council for New England; but as this vested in them the property of the soil rather than adequate powers of municipal government,[2] and as, without further confirmation of this grant, they were exposed to litigations from the claims of other patentees, as well as exceptions to the validity of the laws they might establish, with the caution natural to men conversant with business affairs, they deemed it expedient to apply for a Royal Charter. In obtaining this instrument, the most shameless duplicity and unblushing effrontery have been charged to the Company by late writers;[3] but his Majesty and his Council were satisfied of the honesty of their intentions, and some of the first noblemen of the realm, as the Earl of Warwick, and Lord Dorchester, one of the principal Secretaries of State, aided them in obtaining it; and it is quite as probable that jealousy originated the charge of duplicity, as that the king and his courtiers should have been so easily deceived.[4] The instrument, however, which bears the signature of Charles I., speaks for itself, and is yet in existence in the Archives of the States.[5]

Mar. 4, 1628-9.

[1] Morton's Mem., 73–4; 1 M. H. Coll., 3. 66; N. E. Gen. Reg., 1. 210–11.

[2] Hubbard, 114; Hutchinson, 1. 17, 448; Chalmers, Ann., 97, 136; Douglas, 1. 366; Belknap's N. H., 1. App., xxix; Washburn's Judicial Hist., 9, 11; Haliburton's Rule and Misrule, 29; Hildreth's U. S., 1. 175.

[3] Haliburton, Rule and Misrule, 29; Coit's Puritanism, Letter 7.

[4] See Chalmers, Ann., 136, 147–8, where the documents quoted prove the falsity of this charge.

[5] In the Office of the Secretary of State. Chalmers, Ann., 147, speaks of a copy of this Patent in the old N. Eng. Ent. in the Plant. Office. The document is printed in the Charter and Laws of Mass. Bay; Hutch. Coll., 1–24; Hazard, 1. 239–55; Mass. Rec's., 1. 3–20.

CHAP. VI. 1628 9.

In view of the policy of the monarch[1] and the principles of the applicants, the facility with which this charter was obtained has surprised some writers,[2] and is accounted for by others on the supposition, that the king and his counsellors were willing, even at the expense of some concessions, to "disencumber the realm of a body of men from whom the most unbending opposition to their measures was to be expected."[3] But we incline to the opinion that, on the part of both Charles and his father, "nothing of an enlightened spirit appears in the planning of the English colonies, and that the charter governments were evidently copied from some of the corporations at home." At that period, "it was not difficult for any person, who had interest at court, to obtain large tracts of land, not inferior in extent to kingdoms; and to be invested with a power very little less than regal over them; *to govern by what laws, and to form what sort of constitution he pleased.*[4]

Hence the Charter of the Massachusetts Company was not peculiar, nor was it procured or worded differently from other charters. By its terms, which were similar to the patents to the two Virginia Companies, and the Council for New England, the first Governor and Deputy, and the first board of Assistants, were appointed by the king, and sworn into office before the Masters in Chancery; the right of electing their successors, on the last Wednesday in Easter term annually, was vested in the freeman of the Corporation; and all oaths of office, after the first, were to be administered by the Governor, or Deputy, or two of the Assistants. The executive power was committed to the Governor and Assistants; the legislative to the whole body of the freemen. Courts of Assistants were allowed to be

[1] See the Proclamation, in Hazard, 1. 204.
[2] Robertson's Ann., lib. 10. § 15.
[3] Grahame, 1. 153.
[4] Burke's Europ. Sett's. in Am.; Walsh's Appeal, 44–5

CHAP. VI. 1628-9.

held monthly or oftener, for the business of the Company; and four General Courts were provided for, on the last Wednesday in Hilary, Easter, Trinity, and Michælmas,—in all or any of which laws might be passed, freemen admitted, and officers chosen. The Company was authorized to transport to its plantation all not restrained by law who were willing to accompany them; and all goods were to be free of custom for seven years, and of taxes or imposts for twenty-one years, save £5 per cent. custom dues after the expiration of the first seven years. To the emigrants and their posterity were conceded all the rights of natural born subjects, on taking the Oath of Supremacy and Allegiance, which was *empowered* to be administered rather than expressly *enjoined*[1]—and the right of enacting laws not contrary to the laws of the realm. *Full* and *absolute* power was likewise given "to correct, punish, pardon, govern, and rule" the inhabitants of the colony, and to repel invaders as occasion required. And finally, these letters were to be available to all intents and constructions of law, and were to be "construed, reputed, and adjudged in all cases *most favorably on the behalf, and for the benefit and behoof of the Governor and Company and their successors.*"

Such is an abstract of this celebrated instrument, cherished for many years as a "precious boon." How far it secured to the colonists freedom in religious worship, is a question which has given rise to considerable discussion. The advocates of royalty generally contend that such freedom was not conferred;[2] the friends of the colonists are confident that it was.[3] Mr. Bancroft, however, expresses the opinion that, according to the strict rules of legal inter-

[1] This fact is important, and from inattention to it, false and unfounded charges have been brought against the colonists. Judge Story, Const., 1. 49, too implicitly, we think, follows Robertson, in asserting that "the monarch *insisted* upon an administration of the oath of supremacy," &c.

[2] Robertson, Chalmers, &c.

[3] Neal, Grahame, &c.

pretation, no such privilege was conceded, and that "the omission of an express guaranty left religious liberty unprovided for and unprotected." But, admitting that Puritan worship was necessarily the purpose and the result of the charter, he afterwards adds: "If the privilege could not have been established as a legal right, it followed so clearly from the facts, that, in 1662, the sovereign of England, probably with the assent and at the instance of Clarendon, declared the privilege and foundation of the charter of Massachusetts to be the freedom of liberty of conscience."[1] CHAP. VI. 1662.

In the midst of these conflicting opinions, the truth can best be ascertained by a comparison of the charter with the claims of the colonists, the concessions of Charles, and the clearest rules of common law. It is admitted that the Charter says not a word upon the subject of religious toleration. It contains no clause directly alluding to this matter. And it is also, perhaps, true, that the King had no power to grant such liberty, as it would have been contrary to the statutes of the Anglican Church.[2] But, while the charter does not, nor was it necessary that it should, expressly concede the right of freedom in religious worship, which is the inalienable birthright of man, independent of prince or any other potentate, it does not, except by implication, withhold or deny that right. Charles knew perfectly well that the grantees were non-conformists. He knew that they did not seek this charter to transport the National Church unaltered to America.[3] He knew that they expected some license in religious affairs. Now it is a maxim of English law, and the dictate of common sense and universal equity, that in all cases, where the import of a compact is doubtful, the bias of presumptive construction ought to incline against the pretensions of the party whose office it was to speak, and who had the power to clear every ambi-

[1] Hist. U. S., 1. 343-4.
[2] Cokes Inst.
[3] Hubbard, 109.

CHAP. VI.

guity away.[1] Hence, if it had been the intention of the monarch to have *prohibited* dissent, he should have said so, not by implication, but clearly and explicitly. In legislating for other colonies, the formal establishment of the Church of England, to prevent innovations, was expressly enjoined;[2] and why was not a similar clause inserted in this charter, unless the king was willing to connive at the conduct of the Puritans? As this course was not taken, the inference seems just, that it was at least with his *consent* that the prohibition was omitted, and this pretermission, although it may not have legalized dissent, gave the emigrants virtually all the license they required.

Mar. 2, 1628-9.

Two days before this Charter received the royal signature, the Company was strengthed by the accession of "ten Boston men,"[3] who subscribed to its stock and participated in its adventures; and both previous and subsequent to this date, regular meetings of the Company were held for business. Mr. Endicott, who embarked for America some months before the charter was obtained, arrived at

Sep. 6, 1628.

Naumkeag in about eleven weeks; and a few days later

Sep. 13.

wrote his employers, advising them of his proceedings, and of the wants of the colony.[4] Making known to the "old planters" the purchase of the property and privileges of the Dorchester Company at Cape Anne, and the formation of the new Company under whose auspices he was sent, and removing for his own residence the "frame house" which had been erected at Cape Anne,[5] he entered upon the duties of his office as magistrate and governor.[6]

[1] Grahame, Colon. Hist.

[2] Chalmers, Ann., 15–16; Revolt, 1. 37.

[3] Winthrop and Dudley may have joined at this time, (Dudley's Let., 12,) though Mr. Winthrop's name does not appear on the records until some months after.

[4] Chron. Mass.

[5] Felt's Salem, 1. 122; N. E. Gen. Reg., 1. 206.

[6] Some of our best authorities, as Dr. Bentley, Dr. Young, and Mr. Savage, think no *government* was set up until after the arrival of Mr. Higginson, in 1629; and this statement, without doubt, is substantially correct; yet the visit to Mt. Wollaston seems to have been an exercise of magisterial power.

The "old planters," however, who had engaged in the cultivation of tobacco, being prohibited from continuing this practice,[1] and fearing they were to lose their lands and rights by the absorption of their colony, complained of these changes as reducing them to vassalage; and a controversy arose, which it required all the prudence of Mr. Conant to moderate.[2] To relieve these apprehensions, the Company, in their letter to Mr. Endicott, disclaimed any sinister intentions, and offered that "they should be incorporated into the new society, and enjoy not only those lands which they had formerly manured, but such a further proportion as should be judged fit for them," and thus the dispute ended.[3]

In the meantime preparations were making in England for a second and more extensive emigration. The colonists under Endicott were chiefly "from Dorchester and some places adjoining,"[4] and now a large company from different parts of the kingdom was ready to embark; and, as "suitable persons for the exercise of the ministry" were judged to be necessary, arrangements were made with Francis Higginson, of Leicestershire, a graduate of Emanuel College, and a man "mighty in the Scriptures and learned in the tongues;" Mr. Samuel Skelton, of Lincolnshire, "of gracious speech and full of faith;" and Mr. Francis Bright, of Rayleigh, in Essex, who was "not altogether of the same persuasion as to church discipline" as his associates.[5] Passage was likewise granted to Mr. Ralph Smith; but finding he was a "Separatist," order was given that, unless he would be "conformable to the government of the colony," he should not exercise his ministry within its jurisdic-

[1] Chron. Mass., 136, 146, 147, 182.
[2] Hubbard. 109–10.
[3] Chron. Mass., 145–6.
[4] Dudley's Letter, p. 11, ed. 1696, or as in Force, vol. 2, and Chron. Mass., Chap. xvii.
[5] Johnson, in 2 M. H. Coll., 2. 71–2; Dudley's Letter; Mather, 1. 322–31; Hubbard, 112, 121; Chron. Mass., 142–317; Morton's Mem., 74; Savage on Winthrop, 1. 30.

CHAP. VI. 1629.

tion, and he went first to Nantasket, and thence to Plymouth.[1] The compact with the first three ministers has been preserved; and from its terms, it appears that they might literally be ranked among those commended by the poet, who were

"Passing rich with thirty pounds a year."[2]

Three vessels were provided for the conveyance of this company; the Talbot, of three hundred tons, chartered for the voyage, and commanded by Capt. Thomas Beecher, which was to carry "about a hundred planters;" the George Bonaventure, of three hundred tons, also chartered, and commanded by Capt. Thomas Coxe, which was to carry fifty-two planters; and the Lion's Whelp, a "neat and nimble ship" of one hundred and twenty tons, owned by the Company, and commanded by Capt. John Gibbs, which was to carry forty planters "specially from Dorsetshire and Somersetshire."[3] Three others were to follow the above:—the Four Sisters, of London, burthen three hundred tons, commanded by Capt. Roger Harman; the Mayflower, of Yarmouth, commanded by Capt. William Peirse; and the Pilgrim, of London, commanded by Capt. William Woolridge. In the Mayflower and the Talbot, thirty-five of the Leyden Church were to embark for Plymouth; and most of the other passengers were for "Naumkeag and the Bay."[4] It was arranged that the Talbot, the George, and the Lion's Whelp should sail first, the George having important letters to deliver to Mr. Endicott. Mr. Higginson, with his family, and Mr. Smith, were to embark in the

[1] Chron. Mass., 151–2; 1 M. H. Coll., 4. 109–10 Hubbard, 97, 121.

[2] Hutch. Coll., 24–5; Chron. Mass., 207–12.

[3] Chron. Mass., 50, 179, 215, 216; Hutch. Coll., 33.

[4] Chron. Mass., 39–47, 180, 184 186, 216.—Higginson, Journal, in Chron. Mass., 215, and Mather, 1. 328, speak of but five vessels which came over in 1629; but the Records of the Co. show that there were six. The Pilgrim is not noticed by Mr. Higginson.

Talbot; Mr. Skelton and his family in the George; and Mr. Bright in the Lion's Whelp.[1] When all things were ready, the Lord Treasurer's warrant was obtained, for the departure of "sixty women and maids, twenty-six children, and three hundred men, with victuals, arms, tools, and one hundred and forty head of cattle;"[2] and on the following day, the last letter from the Company to Mr. Endicott was subscribed.[3] CHAP. IV. Apr. 16, 1629. Apr. 17.

As a provisional government was necessary for the colony, arrangements were made for its establishment, and its principal officers were selected. This was to be styled "The Governor and Council of London's Plantation in the Massachusetts Bay, in New England," and was to consist of thirteen members, of whom John Endicott was chosen Governor; and John Browne, Samuel Browne, Samuel Sharpe, Thomas Graves, and the three ministers were to be of the Council. These eight were to choose three others, from among the new emigrants or those of the previous year at their option, and the "old planters" two more, making, with the Governor, thirteen in all. This Government, it should be observed, was strictly subordinate to the Company in England; its members were not chosen by the freemen of the place; and though its powers were extensive, they were by no means unlimited. Punishment for ordinary offenses could be inflicted, but to some cases its jurisdiction did not extend; and in these cases, the guilty parties were to be returned to England for the final Apr. 30, 1629.

[1] Chron. Mass., 142–3; Hutch. Coll., 37.

[2] Prince, from a lost leaf of the Records. See also, Dudley's Lett., ed. 1696; Smith, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3; and Neal's N. E., 1. 125. From inattention to this statement, respectable authors have represented the whole emigration of 1629, as consisting of but two hundred persons; but Higginson, who is quoted as authority for this statement, only asserts that two hundred came in the George, the Talbot, and the Lion's Whelp; and when he says: "There are with us in all, old and new *planters*, three hundred," it is probable that the *servants*, of whom there appear to have been one hundred and eighty in all, are not included in this number.

[3] Chron. Mass., 141; Hazard, 1. 256–68.

CHAP. VI.

adjudication of their offenses, where the supreme legislative authority then lay. Hubbard, speaking of the position of Mr. Endicott, says, he was appointed "their Deputy Governor, in the year 1629, according to his best discretion, with due observance of the English laws, or such instructions as they furnished him with, till the Patent was brought over in 1630."[1]

May 21, 1629.

For the satisfaction of the adventurers, allotments of land were made, of which legal conveyances were to be given in the Company's name; houses were not to be built without the limits of the town unless by special permission; and settlers at the Bay were to be subject to such directions as should be thought meet for that place.[2] The letters of instruction to Mr. Endicott were filled with particulars relating to the colony and its interests. No offense was to be given to the natives; and, that an effort might be made to convert them to Christianity, according to the Charter, some of their children were to be "trained up to reading, and consequently to religion, while they are young." To prevent collisions, the Indians were to come to the plantation only "at certain times and places to be appointed them;" their right to the soil was to be purchased, "to avoid the least scruple of intrusion;" arms were not to be sold them; and, as a guard against hostilities, should any be attempted, all, both planters and servants, were to be "exercised in the use of arms, and certain times appointed to muster them." Thus careful were the Company of the rights of the red race.[3]

[1] Hubbard, 114, 122; Chron. Mass., 66–8, 193, 196, 201–04; Hazard, 1. 268–71; Mass. Rec's.— Hubbard, 115, defines the duty of Mr. Endicott during this period, which was to "take care of the welfare of the company, to order the servants belonging to them, and to improve them in making preparation for the reception of the gentlemen when they should come. And also some endeavors were used to promote the welfare of the Plantation . . . by laying some foundation of religion, as well as civil government."

[2] Chron. Mass., 197–200; Hazard, 1. 275–6.

[3] Chron. Mass., 133–6, 142, 156-9, 172–6.

CHAP. VI. 1629.

For the maintenance of religion among the colonists, the ministers were to be duly respected, and disputes between them and the people were to be carefully suppressed; libertines, masters or servants, were to be admonished and punished; errors were to be "reformed with lenity or mild correction," if possible, but if any proved incorrigible, they were to be shipped back by the Lion's Whelp, rather than left to infect or be an occasion of scandal to others.[1] That the Sabbath might be "celebrated in a religious manner," all labor was to surcease every Saturday throughout the year at three o'clock in the afternoon — a custom long observed by our fathers — and the rest of the day was to be spent in catechising, &c., as the ministers should direct. Morning and evening family devotion was to be observed; laws for the punishment of profanity were to be passed; industry was enjoined, and "no idle drone" was to be suffered in the colony. Intoxicating liquors were not to be sold freely to the savages, and drunkenness among the colonists was to be exemplarily punished. And lastly, a house of correction was to be set up for the punishment of offenders.[2]

With the Seal of the Company[3] and the duplicate of the charter,[4] were sent inventories of goods, cattle and provisions; lists of the several adventurers, with the amount of each one's stock; the names, and distribution into families of the servants of the Company; copies of the agreements with different individuals employed, with their names, and particular directions concerning their employment. As Mr. White, Sir Richard Saltonstall, and Isaac Johnson, Esq., were largely interested in the Company, their interests were to be carefully looked after; and as

[1] It was upon this ground, probably, that Mr. Endicott justified the expulsion of the Browns.

[2] Chron. Mass.,163, 167–8, 176–7, 188–91.

[3] See Chron. Mass., 155.

[4] Yet preserved in Salem. Chron. Mass., 142; Felt's Salem. 1. 86.

CHAP. VI. 1629. Mr. Cradock, the Governor, had extensively invested in different enterprises, these investments were to be managed as much to his advantage as possible.[1]

One other matter is alluded to on the Records of the Company: — the claims of John Oldham, and Sir William Brereton. Oldham, with one John Dorrell, had purchased an interest in the grant to Robert Gorges, of lands between the Charles and Abousett rivers; and being in England in 1628, frequently, during his stay, his claims were brought to the notice of the Company, which esteemed them "void in law." In their letters, they complain of him as delaying their business with his absurd propositions of extraordinary gain; and, finding him tenacious of his real or assumed rights, and an "unfit man to deal with," they "left him to his own way;" and he, with others inimical to the Company, sought to forestall their movements by sending colonists to settle on his claimed lands: — whereupon instructions were sent to Mr. Endicott to forward a party immediately to occupy the ground before his arrival; and an early agreement was recommended to be made with the "old planters," to prevent them from hearkening to his "dangerous though vain propositions."[2]

The claims of Sir William Brereton, who is mentioned with respect, also originated from the grant to Robert Gorges, who, dying without issue, his lands descended to 1628-9. his brother John; and he granted to Sir William a tract in the vicinity of Nahant, and two islands called Brereton and Susanna. Under this grant, leases were made, and families were sent over; and Sir William was himself preparing to emigrate, but was prevented by the breaking out of the civil war, in which, taking the popular side, he found em-

[1] Chron. Mass., 153–90. Antiquarians will regret the loss of these lists of names, none of which are probably now in existence.

[2] Chron. Mass., 169–70; Lewis's Lynn.

232-233

ployment in the Long Parliament and the army, and was at the head of the forces that reduced Chester. As no compromise could be made with him by the Company, his claim and its litigation were bequeathed to posterity; and leaving one son, Sir Thomas, who died without issue, and one daughter, Susanna, who married Edward Lenthall, Esq., of the Inner Temple, the latter, in 1691, claimed the lands in the right of his wife; but his claim met with no countenance from the Committee of the Council, and thus the affair ended.[1] CHAP. VI.

The vessels which were to transport Mr. Higginson and his company to Naumkeag, expected to sail the last of April, but did not leave the coast until some time in May. The George sailed May 4, and arrived June 23; and the Talbot and the Lion's Whelp left Land's End May 13, and arrived in the harbor at Salem June 29. We have a sketch of the voyage of the Talbot from the pen of Mr. Higginson;[2] and soon after his arrival he sent home a description of the country, which was printed at London, in 1630, under the title of "New England's Plantation," in a small quarto of twenty-five pages, which passed through three editions in the course of a year.[3] To this was appended a letter from Mr. Higginson, to his friends at Leicester; another from Mr. Graves, the engineer — and letters in those days were regarded as "sacred scripts," and read everywhere in the kingdom[4] — and a curious "catalogue" of "things needful to Planters."[5] The "flattering" and "hyperbolical" accounts given in these letters, exerted a May 4, 1629. June 23, May 13. June 29.

[1] Chron. Mass., 51; Hutchinson, 1. 23; Mass. Archives, Lands, Vol. 1. 1; Frothingham's. Chas'n., 15, 16; Lewis's Lynn, 44; Drake's Boston, 77. I find frequent references to Sir William in the papers published during the civil war, entitled the "Perfect Occurrences of every day's Journal in Parliament."

[2] Chron. Mass., 213–38; Hutch. Coll., 32–47. We take our dates of the commencement and termination of the voyage of the Talbot from this document.

[3] Chron. Mass., 239–59.

[4] Scottow's Narrative.

[5] Hutch. Coll., 47–50; Chron. Mass., 264–8.

CHAP. VI.

powerful influence upon subsequent emigration, and was one cause, among others, of the setting out of many of Governor Winthrop's party, in 1630.[1]

Either previous to, or immediately upon the arrival of this company, three brothers, Ralph, Richard, and William Sprague, who came to America at "their own cost,"[2] and some three or four others, whose names are not given, by the consent of Mr. Endicott, journeyed to "Mishawum," now Charlestown, where they found one English palisaded house, erected by Thomas Walford, a smith, of the date of whose arrival nothing is certainly known. The site being eligible for a town, the same year Mr. Graves was sent to attend to its survey; the town was modelled and laid out with streets around the hill; the Spragues and others began to build their "huts;" and the "Great House," used for a short time as a Court House, afterwards as a place of public worship, and still later as a tavern, was erected in the square. Mr. Bright accompanied these settlers, and officiated as their minister; but remained not over a year, nor was any church formed until some time afterwards.[3]

June 24, 1629.

Thus at two prominent places, Salem and Charlestown, were settlements commenced by the Massachusetts Company. Mr. Higginson, on his arrival at Salem, found but "about half a score houses built," and one more stately edifice, occupied by Mr. Endicott, though other buildings were doubtless erected by fall, and shelters of some kind were provided for all the emigrants.[4] At Charlestown were but a few "wigwams," the "palisaded house" of Walford, and the "Great House" built by Mr. Graves.

[1] Dudley's Letter, 12, ed. 1696, or the same as in Force, and Chron. Mass.

[2] Chas'n. Rec's., in Chron. Mass.; Frothingham's Chas'n., 13; Everett's Orations, 210–11.

[3] Frothingham's Chas'n., 19, 23; Mass. Rec's. 1. 86, 107; Buddington, Hist, First Ch. Chas'n., 11; 2 M. H. Coll., 2. 165.

[4] Chron Mass., 258; Hutchinson, 1. 18, and Coll., 46–7.

CHAP. VI. 1629.

The exact number of inhabitants at either place cannot be determined. There were, probably, at least one hundred at Charlestown, and nearly four hundred at Salem.[1] Already was the second colony more populous than the first; and in another year, it was destined as with a giant's stride to outstrip it in the race.

The Pilgrims were a church at the date of their landing, and the compact in the Mayflower gave them a government. The Massachusetts Colonists had a government provided for them by the Company in England, which was now established;[2] but as yet no church had been organized. Before the arrival of the second body of emigrants, worship seems to have been conducted in the Episcopal form.[3] Now, however, that ministers had arrived in the colony, the organization of a church was immediately attended to, and a day was set apart for prayer and fasting, and the trial and choice of a pastor and teacher. Consulting with their "Plymouth brethren"[4] concerning their church estate, and requesting their presence on the interesting occasion, a church of thirty members was gathered; elders and deacons were chosen and ordained; a confession and covenant were drawn up and subscribed;[5] and Mr. Skelton was ordained pastor, and Mr. Higginson teacher.[6] Thus the church at Salem was the second in Massachusetts established on the basis of Independent Congregationalism.[7]

July 30.

Aug. 6.

There were some, however, who were dissatisfied with the covenant of this church, and complained because the

[1] Smith, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3; Higginson, in Hutch. Coll., 47. I infer that two hundred planters tarried at Salem, and the body of the one hundred and eighty servants; and one hundred planters went to Charlestown.

[2] Higginson, in Hutch. Coll., 47.

[3] Hubbard, 116; Felt's Salem, 2. 568, 2d ed.

[4] Winslow, in Chron. Pil., 386. Comp. Cotton's Way, 16, 17.

[5] Given by Mather, Mag., Vol. 1.; Bentley, in 1 M. H. Coll., 6. 283–5; Felt's Salem, &c.

[6] Hubbard, 119–20; Morton's Mem., 75–7; Prince, N. E. Chron.

[7] Morton's Mem., 75–7, our principal early authority. Comp. also Heylin's Cosmog., 1027, ed. 1670.

CHAP. VI. 1629.

service of the Episcopal church was omitted. Among these were John and Samuel Browne, the lawyer and the merchant, both of whom were members of the Colonial Council, and of the Massachusetts Company. Their opposition aroused Mr. Endicott to action; and himself one who had little sympathy with anything relating to Episcopacy, he was determined to give no countenance to what he regarded as their "seditious" proceedings; and, as the ministers favored some departure from the forms of the Established Church, and the Governor and Council, with the generality of the people, approved their views, they, "finding these two brothers to be of high spirits, and their speeches and practices tending to mutiny and faction, the Governor told them that New England was no place for them, and therefore he sent them both back to England, at the return of the ships the same year."

Thus was Episcopacy professed and expelled from the Colony. We are aware that the conduct of Mr. Endicott has been severely censured by many writers,[1] and some of the Company in England seem to have trembled for its consequences, and in their letters advised more moderation and prudence.[2] If, however, it is admitted that, upon the broad grounds of Christian toleration, the course of the Puritans can hardly be justified, is it not equally true that the same verdict must be passed upon the course of the English Church? It should be borne in mind, that the Puritans only copied the example set them at home; and, as they came here to enjoy their own faith, in their own way, they regarded the intrusion of the Common Prayer worship among them, as in England their presence was regarded by the National Church, and adopted the same course to rid themselves of its encroachments, as had been adopted there

[1] As Chalmers, Robertson, Coit, Haliburton, &c. Even the prudent Dr. Bentley joins in these censures. 1 M. H. Coll., 6. 245. But see Hubbard, p 64.

[2] Chron. Mass.

to exclude them from the Episcopal Church. We are not now speaking of the propriety of this course on the part of either, nor would it probably be approved by either if enforced at the present day; but we speak of things as they were then; and there was quite as much justice in banishing Episcopacy from New England, as in banishing Puritanism from Old England, or adopting a course which necessitated such banishment. Both parties were doubtless sincere, but both were mistaken. Both have since grown wiser, and for this let us rejoice. We have no wish to justify an exclusive spirit at any time, but we do wish to see as exact justice rendered to Puritans as to Churchmen. Each may learn by the errors of the other, and it would harm neither to copy what is good in the other.

CHAP. VI. 1629.

CHAPTER VII.

TRANSFER OF THE CHARTER.

CHAP. VII. 1629.

In the summer of 1629, the Massachusetts Company and the Massachusetts Colony, were virtually distinct bodies, the latter subordinate to the former, and dependent upon it for support. The Charter of Charles I., gave vitality to the Company. That Charter was at first resident in England, and there its powers were principally exercised. But it seems to have been the intention of part at least of the grantees, and the most influential part, in procuring this instrument, to make it the basis of a civil government in America. Gentlemen of distinguished family and ample estate were connected with the Company. Some of these had already sent servants to New England. And, intending to hazard their persons as well as to employ their fortunes in erecting a Commonwealth on these shores, they were aware of the disadvantages inseparable from the residence of the chief legislative authority in England, and were reluctant to embark unless these difficulties were obviated, and the custody of the Charter was committed to the emigrants. It was their desire to identify the Company and the Colony; to make both one; that the latter might no longer look abroad for its privileges, but act within itself, and exercise, on the place, all the powers claimed by the former.

As yet, the views of these gentlemen seem not to have been openly avowed; but as Mr. Cradock, the Governor of the Company, was doubtless acquainted with the same, and may have himself had thoughts of removing hither, at one

of the General Courts he "presented certain propositions conceived by himself, viz: That for the advancement of the Plantation, the inducing and encouraging persons of wealth and quality[1] to transport themselves and families thither, and for other weighty reasons therein contained, to transfer the government of the Plantation to those that shall inhabit there, and not to continue the same in subordination to the Company here, as it now is." CHAP. VII. July 4. 1629.

It is obvious that the change here proposed was of the utmost importance. By leaving the charter in England, "it would necessarily have followed that all the measures of the corporation would have been taken with final reference to the interests of the undertakers at home. It would have been a company to be enriched, and not a people to be governed."[2] Hence the proposition was calculated to awaken great interest; and the surprise which it caused led to an earnest debate. But, as a matter which could not be hastily decided, its immediate decision was not pressed, and the members were desired "privately to consider it," and to "present their reasons in writing *pro et contra*, at the next court," that the Company might "come to a final resolution;" and in the meantime they were requested to "carry the business secretly, that the same might not be divulged."[3]

The transaction here brought to our notice is unique, and unparalleled in the annals of English colonization; and, as it is one upon which serious charges, affecting the integrity of the Company, have ever since been based, it merits a full and careful discussion. The legality of this transfer has been questioned, and even denied. Mr. Chalmers asserts, that the docket of the grant to Sir Henry Rosewell shows, that "only such privileges as are usually allowed to

[1] It is "worth and quality," in Hubbard, 123.

[2] J. Q. Adams, in 3 M. H. Coll., 9. 203; Willard's Lancaster Address., 19, 20.

[3] Chron. Mass., 85–6.

CHAP. VII. 1629.

corporations in England," were conferred by the King; and that, among the same papers, is one drawn up by Mr. Blathwayt, showing "it was intended thereby the corporation should be resident in England."[1] Hutchinson[2] and Pownal[3] take the same view. And even Judge Story, an eminent American writer, says: "The whole structure of the charter pre-supposes the residence of the Company in England, and the transaction of all its business there."[4]

It may not, however, be unworthy of notice, that the colonists confidently and uniformly maintained that their charter made them a corporation *on the place*.[5] In 1677, the Chief Justices Rainsford and North took the same ground, and the court of Charles II. sanctioned their decision.[6] The Attorney General Sawyer, likewise, gave it as his *official opinion*, that the grantees might transfer their charter, and act in New England.[7] And what, perhaps, is of still more consequence, Charles himself, who granted the instrument, and who probably knew best his own intentions in so doing, did not, so far as we have learned, object to the act at the time it took place, and without interruption from him it was carried into effect.[8]

This conflict of opinion among gentlemen of the legal profession is not a little remarkable were the transaction *palpably* contrary to the law of the realm; and it seems to us to prove, that there may have been circumstances, not now clearly known, which would justify a decision favorable to the Company, rather than impeaching the honor and

[1] Polit. Ann., 147.
[2] Hist. Mass., 1. 20.
[3] Admin. Brit. Col's., 2. 6.
[4] Com. Const., 1. 48. See also Minot, 1. 19, and Washburn's Judicial Hist., 13.
[5] Winthrop, Jour., 2. 351, 354, 360.
[6] Belknap's N. H., 1. App., xxxi. Yet Charles II., in his letter of July 24, 1679, speaks in different terms, and says: "The charter, by its frame and contents, was originally to be executed in this kingdom, and not in New England, otherwise than by deputation, as is accordingly practiced in all other charters of like nature." Hutch. Coll., 519.
[7] Chalmers Ann., 173.
[8] Robertson's Ann., lib. 10. § 20, 21. Comp. Grahame, 1. 161.

integrity of the persons connected with it. One thing, however, is certain: — the step was not taken without *legal advice*, and probably the best which could then be obtained;[1] so that, if it be admitted, judging from the standpoint of English jurisprudence, that the proceeding was *irregular*, the Company is exonerated from having clandestinely and fraudently accomplished it; and in an age of unconstiutional acts, when the example was set by royalty itself, the *fons justitia*, subjects may well be excused for seeking their own interests, especially when their conduct was quite as reasonable as that of their rulers.

But there are other and broader points from which this measure may be viewed. It is generally admitted that the principles which governed both James and Charles in granting patents and charters, were vague and obscure. The corporations created by the crown were strictly royal corporations; the lands which were conveyed belonged to the royal domain; and the prerogatives of the king were vast and undefined.[2] Both father and son, therefore, stood upon their prerogative; nor was it until "the civil wars and the Restoration had decided the nature of the English constitution, had marked out and fixed the various powers of each component part of it, that the nation gave to her provinces permanent systems, analagous to her own."[3] Hence, under the old regime, the grantees, as they were authorized by the wording of their charter, interpreted that instrument "most favorably on the behalf and for the benefit and behoof of the Governor and Company and their successsors." They contended that their charter created a corporation *of*, but not necessarily *within* England; that the powers of government which it granted were *full*

[1] Chron. Mass., 91, &c.

[2] Hazard, 1. 204; Chalmers, Ann., 675, 681–2; Lord Bacon's edit. of Holbourne's "Learned Readings," p. 112–13; R. Williams, in 1. M. H. Coll., 1. 282; J. Q. Adams, in 3 M. H. Coll., 9. 200.

[3] Chalmers, Ann., 682.

CHAP. VII. 1629.

and *absolute*, admitting of no appeal; that they held this not by *commission*, but by *free donation;* that their allegiance was local, not general; that they were not even subject to the *laws* of England, though by the terms of their charter they were to enact no contrary laws; that parliament could not interfere to countermand their orders and judgments, nor could it set over them a general governor without their consent; that, like Normandy, Gascoigne, Burgundy, Flanders, and the Hanse Towns of Germany, so were they "independent in respect of government;" yet a limited allegiance to the mother country was acknowledged, because their commonwealth was founded upon the state, held its lands by an English tenure, and depended upon England for protection, advice, and the "continuance of naturalization and free liegance of themselves and posterity."[1]

Such were the views of the leaders of the Massachusetts Company. Their correctness, in some respects, we are aware has been questioned; in others it has been admitted.[2] And though these views were probably more democratic than were acceptable to Charles I., they were sanctioned by the Long Parliament,[3] nor did the colonists hesitate to avow them to Charles II.[4] And such being their views, they did not look upon their corporation solely as a trading corporation, "under the narrow construction of the common law, but as affording the means of founding a broad political government, subject to the crown of England, but yet enjoying many exclusive privileges."[5] "Other plantations," say they, "have been undertaken at the charge of others in England, and the planters have their

[1] Winthrop's Journal, 2. 341, 345, 347, 348, 351, 352, 354, 360–3, 365–6; Hutch. Coll., 199, 420.

[2] Chalmers, Polit. Ann. Ch. xxii; Hutchinson, 1. 230–1; Pownal Admin., &c., Pt. 2.

[3] Winthrop, Journal, Vol. 2.

[4] Hazard, 2. 591–2; Hutch. Coll., 325–9.

[5] Story on the Const., 1. 51.

dependence upon the companies there, and those planters go and come chiefly for matters of profit; but we came to abide here, and to plant the gospel, and people the country, and herein God hath marvellously blessed us."[1] Hence they looked upon their plantation as of a different nature from the former; and the charter under which it was established was valuable, in their estimation, only so far as it conduced to these ends; which could not be fully attained while it was resident in England, and which could only be effectually secured by taking it with them, and making it the basis of their government, the sanction of its authority, and the vindication of its claims. CHAP. VII. 1629.

Independent of these considerations, however, still broader grounds may be taken in justification of the course of the Company. It seems virtually to have been the maxim of those days, that

"All a man sailed by or saw was his own;"

and this maxim was held, among all the nations of Europe, "a just and sufficient foundation, on which to rest their respective claims to the American continent. It received a universal acquiescence, if not a ready approbation, and became the basis of European polity, and regulated the exercise of the rights of sovereignty and settlement in all the Cis-Atlantic Plantations."[2] And yet, not only did the colonists deny the correctness of this maxim,[3] but the English nation itself, in the reign of Elizabeth, questioned its validity;[4] in the House of Commons, in 1621, a similar position was taken;[5] and eminent writers upon Interna-

[1] Winthrop, 2. 366–7.

[2] Story on the Const., 1. 4; Thurloe's State Papers, 5, 81, in Hazard, 1. 602; Chalmers, Ann., 676–7; Wheaton's R., 8. 574–88, and El. Int. Law, c. 4 § 1–5; Jefferson's Corr., 4. 478; Peters's R., 6. 515, &c.

[3] Rev. in N. E. Justified, 20, 44, in Force, Vol. 4.

[4] Camden's Ann., ed. Hearne, 1717, p. 360.

[5] Chalmers, Ann., 6; Parl. Debates, 1620–1, 250.

CHAP. VII. 1629.

tional Law affirm, that "actual possession and actual occupancy, alone confer a legitimate claim to property and sovereignty."[1] Upon this ground, therefore, neither England nor any other European nation could lawfully claim the soil of Massachusetts, as at that date, save the settlement at Plymouth, the country was occupied only by the Indians.

Again: — It was held as an axiom then, that "an Englishman could not divest himself of the character of subject; he could not say, I will be no longer an Englishman; whithersoever he emigrated, he still owed allegiance to the crown and obedience to the laws of his country; because the weakness of his childhood had been protected by them."[2] But, referring again to writers upon International Law, Vattel and others affirm that, "If the sovereign, or the greater part of the nation, will allow but one religion ni the state, those who believe and profess another religion have a right to withdraw, and to take with them their families and effects. For, they cannot be supposed to have subjected themselves to the authority of men, in affairs of conscience."[3]

In the light of this position, it may be contended that the Puritans, as debarred liberty of conscience by the hierarchy and the crown, had an undoubted right to withdraw from the realm; and, as the territory of Massachusetts was then a "*vacuum domicilium*," occupied by the aborigines alone, they had a right to settle here, especially with the consent of the natives. Upon strictly legal grounds, therefore, if our premises are correct, it follows as a necessary and unavoidable corollary, that the Puritans would have been justified in leaving England, and settling in America, *with-*

[1] Grotius, lib., 2. c. 2; Vattel, c. 18, § 208. See also Story on the Const., 1. 4; Haliburton's Rule and Misrule, 127; Winthrop, 2. 224, &c.

[2] Chalmers, Ann., 15, 675; Hutchinson, 1. 87.

[3] Law of Nations, c. 19, § 223. See also Hutchinson, 1. 230–1.

out any charter from the king. But such a course would have been attended with manifest difficulties. However questionable the claim based upon the fortuitous circumstance of prior discovery, as it accorded with the conventional usage of the age, that claim was allowed, and therefore could not be slighted without bringing the emigrants into open collision with the crown, which might have resulted in their expulsion from the country by an armed force, as the Dutch were afterwards compelled to relinquish their settlement at New Netherlands. Hence a charter was deemed necessary to foreclose these evils; and hence one reason why that instrument was deemed of such value,— because, under its sanction, their right to the soil, was legalized and established.[1] That charter, however, could not deprive the colonists of their natural rights, for these were inalienably theirs. In the estimation of the grantees, it chiefly constituted a connecting link between them and their native land, guaranteeing the encouragement and protection of their Prince; and, as it further conferred full powers of government, it was accepted and cherished through weal and through woe.

CHAP. VII. 1629.

With the Puritans, the idea extensively prevailed, not only among the masses, but among some of the nobility and principal commoners of the realm, that those who left England, and emigrated to America, were at full liberty to establish such government as they chose; and, like the primitive Greek colonies, "to form a new state, as fully, to all intents and purposes, as if they had been in a state of nature, and were making their first entrance into civilized society."[2] They looked upon their plantations abroad, as scions from the parent stock, transplanted to a new

[1] Chalmers, Ann., 677; Belknap's N. H., 1. 13.

[2] Hutchinson, 1. 45; Robertson, lib. 10, § 20; Story on the Const., 1. 51; Chalmers, 682.

CHAP. VII.

clime, sending down roots, and forming a body and branches of their own.

Hence the origin of the proposition for the transfer of the charter. The leaders in the Puritan ranks were experienced statesmen, and skilful diplomatists. The discipline of persecution had developed their minds, and strengthened their purposes. With the theology and politics of their day they were familiarly conversant; and, uniting prudence with firmness, zeal with energy, and resolution with courage, they were looking forward to a higher freedom, both civil and religious, than had been hitherto enjoyed in the land of their birth. This freedom, in its broadest form, may have been imperfectly shadowed forth to their minds; but it was sufficiently understood to render its possession an object of earnest desire and ardent pursuit.

It was in accordance with these views that the present step was taken. The Charter was their own. It had been obtained at great cost, and was designed for their benefit. There was no provision in the instrument itself prohibiting its removal to America. Its integrity was not destroyed thereby. And the most that can be said of the movement, viewing it aside from its political consequences, is, that it transferred the place of holding the meetings of the Company from London to Boston.[1]

Before the meeting at which this transfer was agreed to, some "General Considerations for the Plantation in New England," were drawn up and circulated;[2] and at Aug. 26, 1629. Cambridge, an agreement was subscribed by twelve gentlemen, to the effect that if, "before the last of September, the government and patent of the plantation were legally transferred, to remain with the emigrants, they, with such of their families as were to go with them, would, by the

[1] Bancroft, U. S.; Everett's Orations, 214.

[2] Chron. Mass., ch. 13; Hutch. Coll., 27–32; N. E. Gen. Reg., 6. 209.

first of March, 1630, embark to inhabit and continue in New England."[1] CHAP. VII. 1629.

The transfer of the charter, therefore, was, in one sense, a foregone conclusion. It must either be consented to by the Company, or many of its most influential members would withdraw from it their patronage. Accordingly, when the court convened, the question of transfer, by the erection of hands, was emphatically, and with but little opposition, decided in the affirmative.[2] Yet, to answer the ends of the law, and to obviate the technical objection that the charter created a corporation within the realm, a portion of the members of the Company, who purposed to remain in England, were organized into a board of trade; and with them was left the management of all affairs relating to the interests of the Company, so far as it was connected with the source from which the charter was derived.[3] Aug. 28, 1629.

As this transfer was to blend into one the Company and the Colony, which had before been distinct; and as Mr. Cradock had been hitherto Governor of the Company, and Mr. Endicott the Governor or Superintendent of the Colony, and the charter contemplated but one person as the head of the Company, and its chief executive magistrate, a new choice of officers was judged to be necessary, and a meeting was held for that purpose.[4] Oct. 20. 1629.

Connected with the Company was one, destined to exert a powerful influence upon its prosperity under the new arrangement, and to him attention was instinctively turned as the candidate for the office both of Governor of the Company, and Governor of the Colony. John Winthrop,

[1] Chron. Mass., ch. 14; Hutch. Coll., 25–6.

[2] Chron. Mass., 88.

[3] Chron. Mass.; Hutch. Coll., 100–03; Mass. Rec's., vol. 1.; Felt's "Who was the First Governor," 14.

[4] The account given by Lediard, 518-19, of the settlement of this colony, is amusingly erroneous. He speaks of Mr. Cradock's settling in person at Salem, with Mr. Endicott as his Deputy; and the former growing old, and the latter being unfit for his post, a man of greater quality,—Mr. Winthrop,—was chosen, in his place, &c.

CHAP. VII. 1629.

a native of Groton, in Suffolk,[1] the son and the grandson of gentlemen of the legal profession, and the worthy descendant of a family remarkable for its attachment to the reformed religion, was the one whom nature and providence, as well as his associates, seem to have selected for this weighty and responsible trust. Bred as a lawyer, at the early age of eighteen he was commissioned a justice of the peace. Conspicuous for his virtues, he was exemplary as a Christian, and impartial as a magistrate; blending sweetness with dignity, — the *suaviter in modo* with the *fortiter in re*. Accustomed from youth to an easy and familiar intercourse with persons of refinement and intelligence; associating with the worthiest of the commoners and nobility of the realm; conversant with theology as well as with law; possessed of a comfortable estate of at least £600 income; eminent for his liberality, and distinguished for his hospitality; he was now in the maturity of his powers, and the vigor of his years, having just turned forty, a period when, if ever, the character of the man is developed, and the full energies of his being are brought into activity.

Mr. Winthrop was the master spirit of the Company. Dignified, yet unassuming; learned, yet no pedant; sagacious, yet not crafty; benevolent in his impulses; cordial in his sympathies; ardent in his affections; attractive in his manners; mildly conservative, and moderately ambitions; — he was the man for the colony, every way elaborated and perfected for its purposes; and he enjoys the distinguished honor of being the first Governor chosen by the freemen of the Colony within its limits under the charter after its transfer; and the first who was head both of the Company and the Colony established by that instrument.

[1] For sketches of the life of this eminent man, see Mather, Mag., 1. 108–20; Belknap's Am. Biog.; Moore's Gov's. of Mass.; Winthrop's Journal; Eliot's and Allen's Biog. Dict's.

CHAP. VII. 1629.

Of his associates, Thomas Dudley, the Deputy Governor of the Colony, a native of Northamptonshire, and for some time the Steward of the noble family of the House of Lincoln; Sir Richard Saltonstall, a native of Yorkshire, the founder of Watertown, and a patentee of Connecticut; Isaac Johnson, of Rutlandshire, the husband of the Lady Arbella, daughter of the Earl of Lincoln; John Humphrey, of Dorsetshire, a lawyer, and the brother-in-law of Johnson; William Coddington, of Lincolnshire, for seven years a prominent merchant in Boston, and one of the fathers of Rhode Island; Simon Bradstreet, also of Lincolnshire, the son-in-law of Dudley, the Nestor of New England, and sometime Governor of the colony; and others, of kindred views.;[1]—these were all persons of influence, respectability, and honor. All had been subjected to the rigors of a like discipline. The Massachusetts Colony was by no means the emunctory of the realm.[2] It comprised many of its choicest spirits; men of the noblest views; to whom New England became especially dear, because of its associations with Old England, the home of their infancy and the sepulchre of their fathers. These men, with a vision penetrating beyond the present moment; with a forethought embracing the interests of their posterity as well as their own; anticipating, to some extent, the Commonwealth founded by their arduous labors, purposed, on these shores, to realize their aspirations in erecting a colony of "the best," in which the doctrines they had espoused, and the principles they cherished, might be practically applied to Church and to State.

Fortunate was it for New England that it was settled by such men. Fortunate was it for our country, that its foun-

[1] For sketches of the lives of these gentlemen, see Hutchinson, Young, Savage on Winthrop, &c.; and on Coddington, see his Demonstration, pp. 7, 9, 13.

[2] Thornton's "Landing," p. 70.

CHAP. VII. 1629.

dations were laid at a comparatively advanced stage in the history of civilization; that it was exempted from the necessity of learning, by the experience of centuries, those lessons of political wisdom which are usually among the latest fruits of national development. Our fathers brought with them to these shores the accumulated blessings of the land of their birth — the most favored region, next to America, now on the globe. They brought with them, from Old England, that strong and unconquerable love of freedom, which characterizes the inhabitants of this and of the mother clime; that bold spirit of inquiry, which has contributed so much to the greatness of both; and that invincible energy, which has borne the banner of St. George, and the Stars of our Union, into every quarter of the globe, and even to the most distant and apparently inaccessible regions of the North. But especially did they bring with them the spirit of religious freedom; and it is this, which has given to our country its present commanding position; it is this, which will win for it the proudest, the most durable, and imperishable laurels.

Whether, as has been suggested,[1] the courage of some of the Company failed them as the hour of departure drew near, or whether sickness in their families,[2] or other as probable causes, precluded so early a removal, before the sailing of the fleet which was to conduct hither Gov. Winthrop and his associates, a new Deputy Governor was chosen, and several changes were made in the board of Assistants.[3] The enterprise before all was indeed hazardous; one which exposed them to inevitable dangers, and unevolved sufferings. No Hesperian isles, laden with the

[1] Hutchinson, 1. 24.

[2] Humphrey's Lett. to Winthrop, in 3 M. H. Coll., 9. 233. There is a good notice of John Humfrey in Lewis's Lynn, 115, et seq.

[3] Chron. Mass., 125–7; Hubbard, 124.

riches of tropical fruitage, allured them to scenes of luxurious indulgence. No fabled Elysium, CHAP. VII. 1629.

Nor Sheba's groves, nor Sharon's fields,

bloomed for them upon the rock-bound coast of New England. No Paphian magnificence or Castilian grandeur, could be found in the log hut, or the temporary booth. "The Pleasures, Profits, and Honors of this World, set forth in their most glorious splendor and magnitude by the alluring lady of Delight, proferring pleasant embraces, could not entice, with her Syren Songs, these soldiers of Christ, whose aims were elevated by him many millions above that brave warrior Ulysses."[1] "For myself," says the younger Winthrop, "I have seen so much of the vanity of the world, that I esteem no more of the diversities of countries, than as so many inns, whereof the traveller that hath lodged in the best, or in the meanest, findeth no difference when he cometh to his journey's end. I shall call that my country where I may most glorify God, and enjoy the presence of my dearest friends."[2]

As several hundred persons were to embark with Governor Winthrop, eleven vessels were provided for their conveyance: — the Arbella, formerly the Eagle, of three hundred and fifty tons, the Admiral of the fleet, commanded by Capt. Peter Milborne; the Talbot, the Vice Admiral, commanded by Capt. Thomas Beecher; the Ambrose and the Jewel, the Rear Admiral and Captain, owned by Mr. Cradock, and commanded by Capts. John Lowe, and Nicholas Hurlston; and the Charles, the Mayflower, the William and Francis, the Hopewell, the Whale, the Success, and the Trial. The first four, then at Cowes, were the principal vessels, and were to sail in company, — the rest

[1] Johnson, in 2 M. H. Coll., 2. 75. [2] In Winthrop's Jour., 1. 432.

CHAP. VII.

following after.[1] The whole fleet was "filled with passengers of all occupations, skilled in all kinds of faculties, needful for the planting of a new colony;" who set forth, "some from the west of England, but the greatest number came from about London, though Southampton was the rendezvous where they took ship."[2]

Two other vessels set out for New England before the departure of this fleet. The first, the Lyon, commanded by Capt. William Peirse, sailed from Bristol with eighty passengers, in February, and arrived at Salem in May; and is probably the vessel alluded to by Gov. Bradford, which contained several of the Leyden Church.[3] The second, the Mary and John, of four hundred tons, Capt. Squeb, Master, sailed from Plymouth, March 20th, and arrived at Nantasket the last of May, bringing the Revs. John Warham, and John Maverick, and about one hundred and forty others, "godly families and people" from Devonshire, Dorsetshire, and Somersetshire;—among whom were Rossiter, Ludlow, and young Roger Clap, afterwards conspicuous as a military officer. Ten of these passengers, obtaining a boat of the "old planters," went in her to Watertown, to seek a place of settlement; but eventually the whole company went to Mattapan, and laid the foundation of Dorchester, though many of them subsequently removed to Connecticut.[4]

Feb., 1629-30.

Mar. 20, 1629-30.

May 30, 1630.

Finally, the fleet under Gov. Winthrop was ready for its departure. Mr. Cotton had preached his farewell sermon;[5]

Mar 29, 1630.

[1] Chron. Mass., 83, 92, 93, 99, 101, 127, 137; Winthrop, 1. 2–3; Hubbard, 128–9; Hutchinson, 1. 24; Johnson, in 2 M. H. Coll., 2 79; Coddington's Demonstration, 13.

[2] Hubbard, 133.

[3] Winthrop, 1. 29; Bradford, in Prince; Dudley's Lett., ed. 1696.

[4] Savage on Winthrop, 1. 33, 442; Mather, 1. 399; Clap, in Chron. Mass., c. 18; Prince, N. E. Chronol.; Trumbull's Ct., 1. 23; Hist. Dorch'r., 18; Hist. Chas'n., 40.

[5] Chron. Mass., 126; Scottow's Narr.; N. E. Gen. Reg., 2. 151, 318.—Coddington, Demonstration, 13, says this sermon of Mr. Cotton, and the work known as the Planter's Plea, were published by John Humphrey, the agent of the Mass. Co., "to satisfy the godly minded of our removal out of England."

Mr. Winthrop had given his farewell feast,[1] and had taken leave of his amiable wife.[2] On the 7th of April, the "Humble Request of the Governor and Company" was signed: — a document breathing the purest Christian spirit, designed as a valedictory to England, and a pathetic appeal for the sympathy and prayers of the friends they were leaving.[3] The next day the Arbella and her consorts set sail; and three days later, passing Scilly, and laying their course W. S. W., they stood off into the ocean, and were soon out of sight of land.[4] CHAP. VII. Apr. 7. 1630. Apr. 8. Apr. 11.

The tedium of the voyage, to Gov. Winthrop, was relieved by the preparation of his "Model of Christian Charity,"[5] and the entries in his Journal; and to the passengers, by the exercises of religion, and the care of their families; and, after a cold and tempestuous passage of sixty-one days,[6] the Arbella came in sight of Cape Anne, and on the following day was near Naumkeag. Discharging two signal guns, a skiff was sent to the Lyon, then in the harbor; in about an hour Mr. Isaac Allerton visited them; Capt. Peirse, the Palinurus of the Bay, came soon after; and at two o'clock, P. M., Mr. Endicott, Mr. Skelton, and Capt. Levett arrived.[7] These, at their return, were accompanied by the Assistants, and the Captain of the Arbella, with other "gentlemen and gentlewomen," part of whom slept on shore. The passengers, in the meantime, landed for refreshment, and regaled themselves with strawberries, then in their prime; an Indian chief visited the vessel, and remained over night; and the next day, Masconomo, the Sagamore of Agawam, paid them a visit. At two o'clock June 11. Jun. 12. Jun. 13.

[1] Mather, Mag., 1. 69; Hubbard, 125; Johnson, in 2 M. H. Coll., 2. 75.

[2] Letters, in his Jour. vol. 1.

[3] Mass. Planters, ed. 1696, 1–5; Chron. Mass., 295–9; Hubbard, 126–8; Hutchinson, 1. App. 1; Hazard, 1. 305–7; Mather, 1. 69–70; Coddington's Demonstration, 13.

[4] Winthrop, Jour., 1. 6–10.

[5] See 3 M. H. Coll., 7. 31, et seq.

[6] Reckoning from Ap. 11, the day on which they cleared the coast.

[7] Savage on Winthrop, 1. 30.

CHAP. VII.

Jun. 14. 1630. the Jewel was descried; on the following day the Arbella and the Jewel "warped" into the harbor; and before night most of the company were set ashore, being saluted by the Captain of the Arbella with "five pieces" as they departed. The Ambrose arrived on the 18th of June; the Mayflower and the Whale on the 1st of July; the Talbot on the 2d; the Hopewell, and the William and Francis on the 3d; the Trial and the Charles on the 5th; and the Success on the 6th; and the 8th was observed as a day of thanksgiving.[1]

Jun. 18.
July 1.
July 2.
July 3.
July 5.
July 6.
July 8.

Seventeen ships, bringing about fifteen hundred passengers in all, arrived in the Bay and at Plymouth this year.[2] The settlements then established within the limits of the Massachusetts Colony, were at Wessagusset, now Weymouth, where Weston's Colony was first planted, and where a few of Gorges' Colony seem to have remained, who were probably joined by others before this time;[3] at Nantasket, where were several "old planters," some of whom had removed thither from Plymouth;[1] at Mount Wollaston, where the remnant of Wollaston's Company resided;[2] at Mattapan, where Warham and his companions had fixed their abode;[3] at Salem, where was the largest town; at Mistick, where servants of Mr. Cradock resided;[4] at Lynn, where Ingalls and others had pitched their tents;[5] at Charlestown, which, next to Salem, was probably the largest town in the colony; and at Winisimet, now Chelsea, where we hear of a few planters in 1626.[6] On Noddle's Island, now East Boston, lived the "hospitable Maverick," entrenched

[1] Winthrop, 1. 28–34; Hubbard, 130–2.
[2] Dudley's Lett., 12, ed. 1696; Morton's Mem., 83; Chron. Mass., 310–11, Prince, N. E. Chron.; Drake's Boston, 88.
[3] Winthrop, 1. 52, 111; and Prince and Holmes.
[4] Drake's Hist. Bos'n., 41.
[5] Savage, on Winthrop, 1. 52.
[6] Hutchinson, 1. 37; Hist. Dorchester, 9. See also 2 M. H. C., 2, 86.
[7] Frothingham's Chas'n., 89–93.
[8] Lewis's Lynn, 60.
[9] Hutchinson, 1. 15.

in his fort, upon which "four murtherers" were mounted;[1] Thompson had moved to the island now occupied by the Farm School;[2] and the eccentric Blackstone, an Episcopal clergyman, fond of retirement, and devoted to study, was the sole occupant of Shawmut, now Boston; but he subsequently removed to the banks of the stream which bears his name, and there died in peace, a few weeks before the breaking out of Philip's war, during which his house and his library were consumed.[3]

CHAP. VII. 1630.

Such, two centuries and a quarter ago, was the condition of a State now peopled by a million of human beings! The average yearly increase of inhabitants during this period, has been four thousand five hundred souls. The Indians then outnumbered the colonists; but the red-race has since dwindled to a handfull. The "pale-face" has subdued the country to his dominion, and metamorphosed it from a wilderness into a beautiful garden. Flocks and herds have taken the place of the wolf and the deer; and the tassels of the maize, the waving grass, and the varied productions of agricultural labor, open their ripening fruits to the sun upon grounds once hidden even from the hunter by "tangled thickets, and gnarled oaks, and enormous hemlocks, in thick array, standing as if in defiance of the genial influences of the sky."[4]

> "Where peeped the hut, the palace towers;
> Where skimmed the bark, the war-ship lowers;
> Joy gaily carols where was silence rude;
> And cultured thousands throng the solitude."

The new comers, however, on landing at Salem, found not the colony in a flourishing condition. Above eighty had

[1] Johnson, in 2 M. H. Coll., 2. 86; Josselyn, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 220.

[2] Johnson, in 2 M. H. Coll., 2. 86; Hubbard's N. Eng.

[3] 2 M. H. Coll., 10. 170–3; Bliss's Rehoboth, 2–14.

[4] J. Q. Adams, in 3 M. H. Coll., 9. 199.

CHAP. VII. 1630. died the previous winter; the survivors were wasted by sickness, and had scarce corn and bread enough for a fortnight's supply; and, there being no food to spare, the remainder of a body of one hundred and eighty servants, sent over in 1628, and in 1629, whose transportation had cost the Company from £16 to £20 each, were liberated, and left to shift for themselves, — some wandering to Plymouth, some scattering to other plantations, and many returning to England.[1]

Salem was already well supplied with inhabitants; and, as it "did not suit for the capital town," the extension of the area of settlement towards the Bay was advised.[2]

Jun. 17. Hence, three days after the arrival of Governor Winthrop, he with others, sailed "up the Mistick," which he found "a good place," and spending one night with the hospitable

Jun. 19. Maverick, he returned at the end of two days by the way of Nantasket, where a difference between Capt. Squeb and the passengers of his ship was amicably adjusted.[3] A second party following the first, "to approve or dislike their judgment," found a place which suited them better, "three leagues up Charles river;"[4] and the removal from Salem

July 10. being resolved upon, in July most of the emigrants landed at Charlestown; the Governor and several of the principal men dwelt in the "Great House;" the multitude set up cottages, booths, and tents, about the Town Hill;[5] and during the summer, public worship was held in the open air, under the shade of a venerable oak, where Mr. Wilson, afterwards minister of Boston, and Mr. Phillips, afterwards of Watertown, regularly preached.[1]

[1] Dudley's Lett., 12–13 ed. 1696; Smith, in 3 M. H. Coll. 3. 40; N. E. Gen. Reg., 2. 240; Drake's Boston, 132.—Bancroft mistakes in saying nearly two hundred servants were liberated.

[2] Prince, Chron.; Hubbard, 134; Mather, 1. 72; Dudley's Lett., 13.

[3] Winthrop, 1. 32-3; Dudley's Lett., 13. This was not a land journey, as Hubbard represents it.

[4] Prince, Chronol.; Chron. Mass., 312; Dudley's Lett., 13.

[5] Chas'n. Rec's., in Chron. Mass., 378; R. Clap, in ibid., 351; Frothingham's Hist. Chas'n., &c.

[1] Clap, in Chron. Mass., 351. Buddington's First Ch., Chas'n., 35

CHAP. VII. 1630.

But the arrival at Charlestown was to no scene of gaiety and pleasure. The length of the passage had engendered much sickness, and the want of provisions brought the miseries of famine. Dr. Fuller, of Plymouth, who was present, writes: "The sad news here is, that many are sick and many are dead. The Lord in mercy look upon them! I can do them no good, for I want drugs, and things fitting to work with."[1] The settlers at Dorchester participated in these sufferings;[2] at Salem a like distress prevailed;[3] "senseless trees and echoing rocks" resounded with the cries of the perishing and famishing; and the courage of Gov. Winthrop, whose goodness and fortitude were signally displayed amidst the want and wretchedness which so generally prevailed, alone saved his companions from utter despondency, and inspired hope on the brink of despair. With an unsubdued spirit he wrote his wife, who was detained in England: "I praise the good Lord, though we see much mortality, sickness and trouble, yet, such is his mercy, myself and children, with most of my family, are yet living and in health. We may not look at great things here. It is enough that we shall have heaven, though we should pass through hell to it.... I thank God, I like so well to be here, as I do not repent my coming; and if I were to come again, I would not alter my course, though I had foreseen all these afflictions."[4]

The deaths which occurred were many and appalling. The venerable Higginson deceased soon after the arrival of Winthrop, in the hour of his departure the future prosperity of New England, and the glories of its many churches, floating in cheering visions before his eyes.[5] The wives of Pynchon and Coddington, two of the Assistants,

[1] Letter, in 1 M. H. Coll., 3. 76. See Buddington, 35, and Frothingham's Chas'n.

[2] R. Clap, in Chron. Mass., 351–2; Johnson, in 2 M. H. Coll., 3, 125.

[3] Dudley's Lett., in Chron. Mass., 325; Felt's Salem.

[4] Winthrop, 1. 352–3.

[5] Morton's Mem., 78; Bancroft, U. S., vol. 1.

CHAP. VII. 1630. and of Phillips and Alcock, died during the summer. But the loss most deeply felt, and which spread an unusual gloom over the colony, was of the Lady Arbella, wife of Isaac Johnson, Esq., who, "coming from a paradise of plenty and pleasure in the family of a noble Earldom, into a wilderness of wants," and unable "to stem the tide of these many adversities of her outward condition," died at Salem, leaving her husband, "a holy man and wise," "so overwhelmed in a flood of tears and grief,

Sep. 30. that about a month after," he also died "in sweet peace, to the extreme loss of the plantation, of which he was an eminent benefactor."[1]

Sep. 20. On the 20th of September, William Gager, "a right godly man," and a skilful physician, died; Mr. Rossiter,

Oct. 23. another of the Assistants, died the next month; and before

Dec. the end of December, two hundred, including those lost on the passage, had gone to the grave.[2] The want of good water was an additional grievance. None but running springs were thought suitable for a town, and only a brackish spring by the sea-side had yet been discovered.[3] Hence a further dispersion of the colonists took place; and Sir Richard Saltonstall, Mr. Phillips, and others, settled at Watertown; Mr. Pynchon and others settled at Roxbury; Mr. Dudley, Mr. Bradstreet, and others settled at Newtown; others went to Lynn; others to Mistick; and there being an excellent spring at Shawmut, near the residence

Sep. 7. of Blackstone, by his invitation, before the death of Mr. Johnson,[4] a number of persons removed thither, who

[1] Winthrop, 1. 40; Dudley's Lett., 14–16; Johnson, in 2 M. H. Coll., 2. 87; Hubbard, 132–3.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 40, 44; Dudley, 16, and in Chron. Mass., 319; Hutchinson, 1. 25.

[3] Chas'n Rec's., in Chron. Mass., 379–80; Hist Chas'n., 42, &c.

[4] Mr. Buddington, Hist. First Ch. Chas'n., says some went in August, in which he is probably right; yet Johnson, in 2 M. H. Coll., 2. 88, says October; and Hubbard, 134, says November. But the Mass. Rec's., 1. 75, say the name was given the town in Sep., and hence it must have been settled by some before that date.

were followed by Gov. Winthrop, Mr. Wilson, and others, and laid the foundation of Boston.[1] Thus the settlement of several towns was commenced; and to those who came after, this dispersion, though regretted at the time, was a benefit by giving more opportunity for choice in the selection of an abode.[2] CHAP. VII. 1630.

Meanwhile several of the ships which had brought the emigrants to America were preparing for their return; and, as the sufferings of the colonists were great, over a hundred persons, becoming disheartened, left the country. Mr. Revel, Mr. Vassall, and Mr. Bright went back in the Lyon; and with Capt. Peirse, her commander, arrangements were made for speedy supplies.[3] The departure of these vessels, and the removal of many to Piscataqua, sensibly diminished the number of mouths to be fed; and in a voyage to the South of Cape Cod, a quantity of corn was obtained, which afforded a temporary relief. Oct.

Before the last of December, winter set in with great severity; and many distressing accidents occurred during its raging storms.[4] Nor did the coldness of the weather nor the frequent fasts of the people entirely check the inroads of disease; for the death of a daughter of Mr. Sharpe, a "godly virgin," amiable and accomplished, and of a daughter of Mr. Ruggles, who, though but eleven years old, went to the grave in full "faith and assurance of salvation," are chronicled among the saddening events; as also the death of the wife of Mr. Skelton.[5] Dec. 24. Jan'y., 1630-1. Mar. 15, 1630-1.

Before Spring, the "wolf of famine" was at the door; "clams, muscles, ground nuts and acorns," became the chief

[1] Dudley, 14, and in Chron. Mass., 313; Chas'n. Rec's., in ibid., 381; 2 M. H. Coll., 4. 202–3; Loring's Hund. Orators.

[2] Dudley's Let., 13–14, and the Chas'n., Rec's.; also Hubbard, 134–5.

[3] Winthrop, 1. 448; Dudley's Lett. 15, and the Chas'n. Rec's.; Hubbard, 140.

[4] Winthrop, 1. 46–9, 57, 65; Dudley, in Chron. Mass., 322–3, 338–9; Josselyn, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 377.

[5] Dudley, 22, and in Chron. Mass., 327, 329, 339; Morton's Mem., 83–4.

CHAP. VII. 1630-1.

dependence of many who had been accustomed to the comforts of luxury; and even these palliatives of hunger were difficultly obtained. With intense anxiety, therefore, was the return of Mr. Peirse awaited; and with agonizing despair did fathers and mothers look out upon that wild and sullen waste of waters surging before them, straining their eyes to catch a glimpse of the much wished for sail. But day succeeded to day, and week to week, with no signs of its appearance. The provisions of all were spent. The Governor's last bread was in the oven. And the prospect before all was death in its most appalling and ghastly form.[1]

Feb. 6. In the midst of this distress, a fast was appointed;[2] when lo! "He who delights to appear in the greatest extremities, and to magnify his mercies by the seasonableness of them, gave this pious people sweet experience of the faithfulness of his promise: 'Before they call, I will answer, and while they are speaking, I will hear;'" — for Feb. 5. the very day before the fast was to have been held, the Lyon arrived at Nantasket, laden with provisions, and Feb. 9. bringing twenty-six passengers; and four days after, she came to anchor before Boston, where she "rode very well, notwithstanding the great drift of ice." In gratitude for this mercy, the fast was changed into a thanksgiving, Feb. 22 which was celebrated throughout all the colony with ardent rejoicing.[3]

Such was the bitter experience of the first year of colonial life in the Bay. Happily for the people, the Indians did not molest them. An alarm from the Narragansets preceded their arrival; but Sagamore John revealed the Sep. 28, 1630. plot, and prevented its execution.[4] The apprehension of

[1] Johnson, Mather, &c.

[2] Hutchinson, 1. 28, mistakes in saying the fast was appointed for Feb. 22. That was the day of thanksgiving.

[3] Winthrop, 1. 49–56; Dudley, 22–4, and in Chron. Mass., 330–2; Hubbard, 139; Trumbull's U. S., 1. 92. See Orders in Council, in N. E. Gen. Reg., 8. 135.

[4] Chas'n. Rec's., in Chron. Mass., 377; Frothingham's Chas'n., 25.

hostilities led to a tax for military purposes,[1] and to the plan of a fortified town near Boston, as a retreat in case of an assault;[2] and in the following spring, it was provided by law that every person, in every town, magistrates and ministers only excepted, should be suitably armed.[3] A false alarm at Watertown,[4] led to the establishment of a night watch at that place and at Dorchester;[5] a "court of guard" was likewise ordered on the neck between Boston and Roxbury, and at Charlestown; and "monthly trainings" were instituted in all the principal towns.[6] CHAP. VII. Mar. 22, 1630-1.

But the chiefs inclined to peace rather than to war. Chikatabot, with his "sannops and squaws," visited Boston, and presented the Governor with a hogshead of Indian Corn;[7] from the banks of the "Quonehtacut" came Wahginacut, a Mohican sagamore, to solicit a plantation of the English as a bulwark against the Pequots;[8] the son of Canonicus, the great sachem of Narragansct, brought offerings of friendship;[9] and Miantonomo himself came to the settlement, with a number of his followers, remained over Sunday, and attended public worship.[10] March and April, 1631. Apr. 4. July. Aug. 5, 1632.

Yet some hostile demonstrations were made. There was an alarm from the Mohawks, who were at war with the Nipmucks;[11] an incursion of the Tarratines upon sagamore John, near Lynn;[12] a broil between the Plymouth people, and some of the Narragansets;[13] an alarm of the presence of Indians at Brookline;[14] one or two murders were committed at the Eastward;[15] and suspicions being entertained May, 1631. August, 1631. April, 1632. August, 1632. Sept., 1632.

[1] Mass. Rec's., 1. 77.
[2] Winthrop, 1. 45–6; Dudley's Lett. 14; Hubbard, 135–6; 1 M. H. Coll., 7. 9.
[3] Mass Rec's., 1. 84.
[4] Winthrop, 1. 59; Dudley's Lett.
[5] Mass. Rec's., 1. 85.
[6] Winthrop, 1. 64; Mass. Rec's., 1. 85, 90.
[7] Winthrop, 1. 58, 64.
[8] Winthrop, 1. 62.
[9] Winthrop, 1. 70.
[10] Winthrop, 1. 103; Hubbard, 144.
[11] Winthrop, 1. 66.
[12] Winthrop, 1. 71, 73; Hubbard. 145; Johnson, 2 M. H. Coll., 3. 126; Lewis's Lynn, 75–6.
[13] Winthrop, 1. 87, 89.
[14] Winthrop, 1. 105.
[15] Winthrop, 1. 75, 106; Mass. Rec's., 1. 95.

CHAP. VII.

of a general plot of the Indians against the English, the colonists were "mustered:" but this muster, alas! rather ludicrously betrayed the lack of thorough military discipline, and the presence, on the part of some of the soldiers, of that questionable species of courage alluded to by the poet:

"He that runs away,
May live to fight another day."[1]

Fortunately, a messenger being sent to the three principal sachems, the alarm was quieted; and the small-pox breaking out soon after, sweeping off the natives with frightful rapidity, and desolating whole tribes, they were too much weakened to think of war; and the unwearied attention and kindness of the English to them in their agonizing distress, though it could not avert from them the shafts of disease, infixed in their minds feelings of gratitude for these favors, and remorse for their treachery, and attached them more firmly to those who had proved by their deeds their pacific intentions and Christian compassion.[2]

Sept., 1633.

Jan., 1631-2.

Previously, excursions were made into the wilderness around Boston;[3] and to cultivate friendship with the Pilgrims, a visit was made to the settlement at Plymouth, by Governor Winthrop, Mr. Wilson, and others. Proceeding to "Wessaguscus" by water, thence, on the ensuing day, the party journeyed by land, pursuing the Indian trail through Scituate, Hanover, Pembroke, and Kingston; and, as a mark of respect, the visitors were received without the town by Governor Bradford, Elder Brewster, and others, and conducted with due formality to the residence of the former, where they were "kindly entertained, and

Oct. 25, 1632.

[1] Winthrop, 1. 106–7; Mass. Rec's., 1. 75.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 137–8, 142–3; Hubbard, 194–5; Cotton's Way, 80–1; Johnson, in 2 M. H. Coll., 3. 127; Chas'n. Rec's., in Chron. Mass. 386–7; Morton's Mem., 92.

feasted every day at several houses." Tarrying over Sunday, and partaking of the Lord's Supper, at the close of the afternoon service a question was propounded, to which the pastor, Mr. Smith, first spoke briefly; then Roger Williams "prophesied;" next Governor Bradford spoke; and after him Elder Brewster, and "some two or three more of the congregation;" and, at the request of Elder Brewster, Governor Winthrop and Mr. Wilson closed the discussion. Before the dispersion of the assembly, Dr. Fuller, the deacon, reminding the congregation of the duty of contribution, "the governor and all the rest went down to the deacon's seat, and put into the box, and then returned.[1]" On the journey home, Governor Winthrop was conveyed over Ludham's Ford "on a man's back," [2] and after an absence of seven days, the party reached Boston, much pleased with their trip. [3] CHAP. VII. 1632. Oct. 31.

The accessions to the colony in 1631, were but few. The principal new comers were the Rev. John Eliot, afterwards distinguished as the Apostle to the Indians, and the wife of Governor Winthrop, with his eldest son, and other of his children. The popularity of the Governor was pleasingly testified on this occasion, by the liberal presents of provisions which he received from his neighbors, who seemed to vie with each other in crowding his larder with "fat hogs, kids, venison, poultry, geese, partridges, &c., so as the like joy and manifestation of love had never before been seen in New England." [4] Nov. 1631.

[1] Comp. Lechford's 'Plain Dealing,' in 3 M. H, Coll., 3; Baillie's Dissuasive, 30; Hubbard, 65. The latter remarks, of the "custom of the prophesying of private brethren," that it "was not observed afterwards in any of the churches of New England besides themselves, the ministers of the respective churches there not being so well satisfied in the way thereof, as was Mr. Robinson. The elders likewise of the said churches, or the most judicious and leading among them, as Mr. Cotton, &c., that were not absolutely against the thing, were yet afraid that the wantonness of the present age, would not well bear such a liberty, &c."

[2] See the author's Hist. Hanover, and Deane's Scituate.

[3] Winthrop, 1.108–10.

[4] Winthrop, 1. 76–80.

CHAP. VII.

In 1632, and 1633, the arrivals were more numerous; and the Rev. Mr. Wilson, the first pastor of the church in Boston, returned from his visit, and Mr. Richard Dummer, Rev. Mr. Welde, Mr. Timothy Hatherly, and Mr. Coddington and wife, were added to the list of settlers in the Bay.[1] A little bark of thirty tons, called the "Blessing of the Bay," one of the earliest vessels built in Massachusetts, had been constructed at Mistick for Governor Winthrop, and had taken a trip to the South; and in the fall of the first of these years, she returned, having visited the Indians on Long Island, and the Dutch settlement at New York, where her Captain enjoyed the distinguished honor of holding a personal interview with the renowned "Wouter Van Twiller," that "robustious beer barrel on skids," whose imperturbable gravity and unutterable ponderings are duly immortalized by "Diedrick Knickerbocker."[2]

Oct., 1632.

Sept. 4, 1633.

The most important arrival of these years, was of the Griffin, with two hundred passengers, including eminent ministers, and eminent laymen, some of whom with difficulty succeeded in escaping from England, so strict was the surveillance of the Court of High Commission. John Haynes, for one year Governor of Massachusetts, and for several years Governor of Connecticut; a native of Essex, in England, and an occupant of the elegant seat called Copford Hall; a gentleman of liberal mind, and unassuming judgment; pacific in his temper, and spotless in his life; who, by his ability as a legislator, the integrity of his heart, and the ripeness of his judgment, endeared himself to all, and is worthy to be named in connection with John Winthrop; Atherton Hough, a prominent Assistant in the Massachusetts Colony; and Thomas Leverett, the ruling elder through life of the church of Boston, were among the laymen: — and John Cotton, a native of Der-

[1] Winthrop, vol. 1.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 69, 72, 134; Hubbard, 171–2.

byshire; like Winthrop the son of a Puritan lawyer; a graduate of Trinity College; precocious in youth, and distinguished in manhood for the brilliance of his talents, and the fervency of his manner, joined to a remarkable mildness and gentleness of temper which won for him an enviable reputation; one whose suavity of deportment, profoundness of learning, and evidently progressive tendencies, notwithstanding his hatred of heresy, and his enmity to democracy, gave him an ascendency in the church, and an influence in the state, which might have been dangerous in a person of less elevated character; and whose prudent counsels, humble deportment, and rare powers of conciliation harmonized conflicting opinions, moderated the violence of the spirit of controversy, and guarded safely the interests of the colony amidst the storms and perils which it subsequently encountered; Thomas Hooker, the Light of the Western Churches, and the rich pearl which Europe gave to America, a prodigy of learning, and an eloquent orator; and Samuel Stone, the worthy pastor of the church at Hartford; were among the ministers; — and the arrival of the last three gave rise to the pithy saying, that "the God of heaven had supplied the colonists with what would in some sort answer their three great temporal necessities: Cotton for their clothing, Hooker for their fishing, and Stone for their building."[1] CHAP. VII. 1633.

In spiritual affairs, ever first in the minds of the Puritans — "it being as unnatural for a right New England man to live without an able ministry, as for a smith to work his iron without a fire"[2] — good progress was made in the four years following their arrival in New England. The church at Boston, the third in order of time in the colony, July 30, 1630.

[1] Scottow's Narr., 23; Mather, 1. 392–5. For more extended notices of these gentlemen, see Mather, Hutchinson, and Trumbull; Young, in Chron. Mass.; Savage, on Winthrop; Emerson, Hist. First. Ch., &c., &c.

[2] Johnson, in 2 M. H. Coll., 7. 40.

CHAP. VII.

was gathered at Charlestown about three weeks after reaching that place; and two years later the Church at Charlestown, the seventh in the colony, was separately organized.[1] The Church at Watertown, the fourth in order of time, organized at the same date as that of Boston, was involved in difficulties for a season, in consequence of the "heresies" of its pastor, and one of its elders; but these were soon settled, and peace was restored.[2] The church at Lynn, the fifth in the colony, was also involved in difficulties with Mr. Stephen Batchelor, and a new church was gathered in 1636, of which Samuel Whiting, of Boston, in Lincolnshire, one of the worthiest ministers of those days, was chosen pastor.[3] The churches at Roxbury, under Messrs. Welde and Eliot; at Dorchester, under Messrs. Maverick and Warham; and at Newtown, under Messrs. Hooker and Stone, were at peace. That at Salem was agitated by the controversy with Mr. Williams; but of this we shall have occasion to speak hereafter.

Nov. 2, 1632.

July 30, 1630.

June 8, 1632.

1636. to 1650.

Nine churches at least were in existence in the Massachusetts Colony before 1636; and before 1650, twenty were added to the number, making twenty-nine in all,[4] over most of which "godly ministers" were settled, of respectable talents, and commanding influence, who were as "burning and shining lights" in the propagation of their own system of "Orthodox faith," and zealous in suppressing heretical opinions, and in laboring to preserve the unity and purity of the churches of the land.

Since those days, what changes have taken place! — changes, to some, pregnant with evil; — changes which the

[1] Winthrop, 1. 36–9; Morton's Mem., 84; Hubbard, 185–8; Emerson's Hist. First Church, Bos'n.; Buddington's Hist. First Ch.,Chas'n., Frothingham's Chas'n., &c., &c.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 70, 81, 97, 113; Hubbard, 142–3, 187; Mather, 1. 141; Francis's Hist. Wat'n.

[3] Winthrop, 1. 187, 210–11; Hubbard, 191–4; Lewis's Lynn, 78–9. An excellent notice of Mr. Whiting may be seen in Lewis, 160–6.

[4] Savage, on Winthrop, 1. 114, the best authority on these matters with which we are acquainted.

far seeing hail with joy. Churches and sects have multiplied and increased; creeds and opinions have been essentially modified; and, though the Episcopal Church may boast that it has "made no change,"[1] out of this conflict of Puritan intellect has sprung that spirit of toleration, which is shedding abroad its beneficent influences; and a warmer, and a more comprehensive Christian charity, is not only weaving into kindlier union the various branches of the great Christian Church, but is extending its roots through all grades of society, prompting philanthropy to succor the needy, reform the vicious, instruct the ignorant, relieve the oppressed, and lift up the down-trodden, the outcast, and the despised; and infusing into the great heart a more vigorous life, which will hereafter, we doubt not, lead to still nobler attainments, in the diffusion of intelligence, civilization, and the yet inexhausted blessings which the gospel of Christ has in store for the world as it becomes better fitted to receive and enjoy them.

[1] Coit's Puritanism.

CHAPTER VIII.

SETTLEMENT OF CONNECTICUT. THE PEQUOT WAR.

CHAP. VIII.

THE government of the Massachusetts Colony, for the first four years following the transfer of the Charter, was committed to the hands of the excellent Winthrop, than whom, perhaps, no one better qualified for the office could well have been selected. But the wisest and best find that life is not all sunshine, and that popular favor is often inconstant. Among the hundreds who had emigrated to America, there were not wanting some of a factious temper, with whom liberty might easily degenerate into licentiousness. Nor were there wanting ambitious minds, eager for political preferment, and anxious to hear their own names

"Swell the trump of future fame."

In the management of such a body of men, exulting in their escape from the oppressions of the mother country, and luxuriating in the sense of newly acquired freedom, it would not be strange if some errors were committed, or if those prejudices were awakened, which are easily induced by conceived assumption of authority in magistrates, or conceived encroachments upon civil and spiritual rights. Such assumptions were supposed to have been made; and, attributing to Mr. Winthrop a desire to perpetuate his incumbency of the office he held, the freemen, full three

May 13, 1634.

hundred and forty in number,[1] resolved to make their power felt in electing a new Governor.

[1] Not three hundred and eighty, as in Bancroft, 1. 364. The exact number was three hundred and forty-one. See Mass. Rec's., 1. 366–9. The error of Mr. B. probably originated from oversight, in computing from the statements of Savage, on Winthrop, vol. 2, App. C., where, in the first table, are the names of about forty persons who were *proposed*, but were not then *made* freemen.

CHAP. VIII.

Mr. Cotton, recently arrived in the country, and admitted to citizenship, entered the lists in defense of one with whose views he so fully sympathized; and in a public discourse, on the day of the election, maintained that the right of an honest magistrate to his place was like that of a proprietor to his freehold, and that neither should be removed unless convicted of injustice. This was an aristocratic position which many disliked; the court discussed the doctrine with no little freedom; and the opinion of the ministers being asked, they prudently deferred it "to further consideration;" but the people, impatient of control, and more democratic in their views, followed their "own notions," and Thomas Dudley was chosen Governor, and Roger Ludlow, Deputy Governor; but, with the exception of the election of Mr. Haynes as one of the Assistants, no other change was made, and "all the other Assistants were chosen again." [1]

There had been, for some time, a misunderstanding between Mr. Winthrop and Mr. Dudley, growing out of personal matters, as well as those of public concern; and although an outward reconciliation had been effected, the spirit of jealousy seems not to have been wholly laid; and, possibly upon the principle that all is fair in politics, a little manœuvering may have been resorted to by Mr. Dudley, to ingratiate himself into the favor of the people. [2] And a step soon taken seems to confirm this view, for in the fall of the same year, Mr. Winthrop was called to an account for his receipts and disbursements during his administration. On this memorable occasion, although he might have justifiably "torn his book of accounts as Scipio Africanus did, and given this answer: 'A colony, now in a flourishing estate, has been led out and settled under my

Sept., 1634.

[1] Winthrop, 1. 157; Hubbard, 156.

[2] Winthrop's Journal. Mr. Dudley's version of these matters has not descended to us.

CHAP. VIII.

direction; my own substance is consumed;—spend no more time in harangues, but give thanks to God;'"—yet, for the vindication of his character, his frank reply was: "In all these things I refer myself to the wisdom and justice of the court, with this protestation, that it repenteth me not of my cost or labor bestowed in the service of this Commonwealth, but do heartily bless the Lord our God, that he hath been pleased to honor me so far as to call for anything he hath bestowed upon me, for the service of his church and people here, the prosperity whereof, and his gracious acceptance, shall be an abundant recompense to me."—"I conclude," he adds, "with this one request, which in justice may not be denied me,—that as it stands upon record, that upon the discharge of my office, I was called to account, so this my declaration may be recorded also, lest hereafter, when I shall be forgotten, some blemish may lie upon my posterity, when there shall be nothing to clear it."[1]

May, 1635.

Mr. Dudley's term of office was much shorter than that of his predecessor; for the next year another change took place, and John Haynes was chosen Governor, and Richard Bellingham, Deputy Governor; Mr. Ludlow, the former Deputy, being left out entirely, "partly because the people would exercise their arbitrary power, and partly upon some speeches of the deputy, who protested against the election as void, for that the deputies of the several towns had agreed upon the election before they came."[2]

During the magistracy of Mr. Haynes, "godly people in England beginning to apprehend a special hand of God in raising this plantation, their hearts were generally stirred to come over," and Massachusetts Bay was thronged with squadrons, three thousand emigrants arriving, notwith-

[1] Winthrop, Journal, 1. 476; Mass. Rec's., 1, 131-2; Hutchinson, 1, 43-4.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 188.

standing the vexatious restrictions imposed by the Council and the Crown; and among the distinguished persons of the clergy and of the laity, who became residents of the colony, temporarily or permanently, were Roger Harlakenden, of Earl's Colne, Essex, who died a few years after his arrival;[1] Anthony Thacher, the thrilling narrative of whose shipwreck, in a storm which is chronicled as the worst that had been known, forms one of the most exciting chapters in our early history;[2] Richard Mather, long the minister of Dorchester, and the ancestor of a succession of eminent clergymen; Thomas Shepherd, the worthy minister of Cambridge; and Hugh Peter, sometime pastor of the English Church at Rotterdam, who settled at Salem, and who, on leaving America, returned to England, became the Chaplain and Counsellor of Oliver Cromwell, and took a prominent part in the transactions of the Commonwealth. Possessing a spirit of unconquerable energy and perseverance; fervid and impressive in his eloquence; popular as an orator, and a republican of great courage; he was welcomed to these shores, and both in public and private labored assiduously for the welfare of the colony, participated in its struggles, suggested new schemes of profitable industry, and recommended his counsels by his own successful example.[3]

The most distinguished personage who arrived at this time, was Henry Vane, afterwards Sir Henry Vane the younger, the heir of one of the most powerful noblemen of England, and a "young gentlemen of excellent parts," whose accession was hailed as an omen of good. He had long been desirous of visiting America, and had only been prevented by the prohibition of his father, who yielded to

[1] Winthrop, 1. 334; Young, in Chron. Mass., 517; 3 M. H. Coll., 8. 268, 315, &c.

[2] Young's Chron. Mass., ch. 23; Hubbard, 199–201.

[3] Winthrop, 1. 202–10; N. E. Gen. Reg.; Hubbard, 177.

CHAP. VIII. 1635.

the commands of King Charles, and suffered him to depart.[1] His attachment to Puritanism, upon whose exercises he waited with unaffected delight, had already led to the sacrifice of his collegiate honors in the University of Oxford; and, valuing "faith and a good conscience" above all things else, he cheerfully relinquished the splendors and enticements which the gay and brilliant world holds out to the young, and "forsook the honors and preferments of the Court to enjoy," on these shores, "the ordinances of Christ in their purity."

But twenty-four years of age at this time, his was indeed a remarkable character. We would by no means be understood as asserting that he was perfect. He was a man, and had doubtless the failings of a man. Yet the gravity of his deportment, the calm and contemplative composure of his countenance, the complete control which he had gained over his passions, with his deep penetration, and his intuitive discernment of the characters and purposes of others, by even Clarendon are noted as extraordinary qualities, rendering him, if not the superior, at least the equal of Hampden;[2] and his profound theological attainments, the purity of his mind, his easy and graceful eloquence, and the brilliance of his genius, won for him the warmest eulogiums of the gifted Milton, who is lavish of his encomiums upon the young champion of liberty.[3] Dark dissimulation was no attribute of his nature.[4] Whatever of enthusiasm he possessed, it was tinged with no fanaticism, stained with no hypocrisy; nor did it precipitate him into injudicious measures, or sanguinary excesses; but added new luster to his acquired abilities, new powers to his natural sagacity;

[1] Neal's N. Eng., 1. 144; Mather, 1; Hutchinson, 1. 65.

[2] Foster's Statesmen of the Commonwealth, 265.

[3] Clarendon, Hist Rebellion, 1. 186-8; 2. 379.

[4] Yet Hutchinson, 1. 56, and Hildreth, 1. 235, charge him with such dissimulation.

and to the latest hour of his life, amidst the wreck of his fortune and the treachery of his associates, with death presented to him in the appalling form of a bloody execution, never, for a moment, did he swerve from his principles, but prepared himself for his fate with heroic and even smiling intrepidity, and encountered it with tranquil and dignified resignation.[1] CHAP. VIII.

Soon after his arrival, he was admitted to the freedom of the colony; and at the ensuing election, he was chosen Governor. It is not improbable that his rank, as the eldest son of a privy-counsellor, gave him some advantage in the eyes of the people;[2] but his character and powers were the strongest recommendations to their favor; and it "became the theme of wonder and admiration with them all, that such a man, so fitted by his talents and position, to sway the destinies of men, in courts and palaces, should choose the better part with the remote and unfriended exiles of the obscure wilderness of Massachusetts."[3] Mar. 3, 1635-6. May, 1636.

Yet his election, welcomed by a salute from the shipping in the harbor, however it may have testified the regard of the people, and their appreciation of his talents, can hardly be considered as equally creditable to their prudence and judgment; for, under the peculiar circumstances of the colony, neither his age nor his experience qualified him for that distinction. It was a period of intense and violent excitement. Popular controversies had preceded his arrival; and to the pressure of external aggressions, were added internal commotions of by no means a trifling nature. Faction and intrigue were rearing their hydra-heads in direst strife. Extraordinary religious dissensions were on the eve of convulsing society to its centre. With the genius of the people he was little acquainted; nor was he

[1] Hallam, Const. Hist., 419; Grahame, 1. 170–1.

[2] Chalmers, Ann., 327–8.

[3] Foster's Statement of the Commonwealth, 268, Harper's ed.

CHAP. VIII.

imbued with the prejudices which their situation had engendered. Some of the principal persons, jealous of the enthusiasm with which he was received, and of his intervention to heal the distractions of the Commonwealth,[1] looked upon him with coldness and mistrust. And, "more for things than persons, spirit than forms," and owning and cherishing goodness everywhere, the liberality of his heart, which refused to be tied down to all the formalities of the age, was little in unison with the cynical moroseness of a portion of the clergy. Hence the day on which he was invested with the purple of magistracy, saw a formidable opposition organized against him, determined to embarrass his government at every step; and so well did his antagonists succeed in involving himself personally in difficulties, and his most intimate friends in hopeless and inextricable confusion, that his administration was brief and stormy; and, by the trials he encountered, he was painfully convinced of his mistake in accepting an office, which, under other and more favorable auspices, there can be no doubt he would have filled as acceptably and as successfully as either of his predecessors.[2]

The first open opposition to his views, was occasioned by an incident in keeping with the times, and illustrative of the principles and policy of the colonists. Mr. Endicott had, some time before, cut the red cross from the flag at Salem, as a "relic of Popery insufferable in a Puritan community;"[3] and although his conduct was censured as "rash and uncharitable," that censure, we apprehend, was quite as much dictated by his sympathy for Roger Williams, who was abjured as a heretic as by the conviction of his judges of the criminality of the act; for not long

Nov. 5, 1634.

[1] Winthrop, 1. 211–14.

[2] See the admirable Memoir of Vane, by Rev. C. W. Upham, in Spark's Am. Biog. Hutchinson, following Hubbard we presume, rather severely calls him an "obstinate and self-sufficient governor."

[3] Winthrop, 1, 175, 188–9, 462–3; Mass. Rec's., 1. 137, 145–6.

after the same judges, upon consultation with the ministers, CHAP. VIII.
"warily" expressed their doubts of the lawfulness of the use of the cross in an ensign;[1] and although some of the people "stood stiff" to retain the emblem, it was proposed to change it to the "red and white rose;"[2] and finally colors were appointed for every company, in which the cross was left out, and the King's arms were inserted Feb. 1, 1635-6.
in the flag on Castle Island.[3]

Three months later the St. Patrick, a vessel belonging May 15, 1636.
to Sir Thomas Wentworth, lord-deputy of Ireland, and afterwards Earl of Strafford, arrived; and on approaching the Castle was boarded by the Lieutenant of the fort, and compelled to strike her flag. Of this act her commander complained as "a great injury," and an apology was offered.[4] Two weeks later one Miller, or Millerd, the May 31, 1636.
master's mate of the Hector, because the King's colors were not displayed at the fort, denounced the colonists as "traitors and rebels;" and being arrested and convicted, he was committed to prison; but a tumult arising among his crew, he was released the next day on the recognizance of the Captain, and the day after, in the presence of the masters of the fifteen vessels then in port, he acknowledged his offense, and was discharged.[5] Suspicious, however, that this submission was dictated by policy rather than by principle, and that his complaints might be renewed in England, and the affair become troublesome, Governor Vane desired the advice of the Captains respecting the omission of the flag; and in a friendly spirit they replied, that it might be best to have the colors displayed, so that,

[1] Winthrop, 1. 179, 183, 186.
[2] Winthrop, 1. 490. Mather, 2. 433, very justly condemns this over scrupulousness.
[3] Winthrop, 1. 215; Hubbard, 164–5.
[4] Winthrop, 1. 222; Hubbard, 240–1.
[5] Mass. Rec's., 1. 178; Winthrop, 1. 225; Hubbard, 241; Coffin's Newbury, 21–2. This acknowledgment bears date June 9, 1636, and seems to have been recorded in Sept., several months after the offense was committed.

CHAP. VIII.

if they were questioned on their return what colors they saw in the colony, they might answer, "the king's."

This, to the scrupulous Puritans, was a dilemma as unforeseen as it was mortifying and distressing; for not a suit of unmutilated colors could be found in the colony! Two of the captains, however, offered the loan of their suits; and though "fully persuaded that the use of the cross in an ensign was idolatrous," a portion of the magistrates inclined to accept this offer; and taking the colors, the Governor promised that they should be immediately set up. But a consultation being held over night with "the ministers," of whom Mr. Cotton alone seems to have agreed with Mr. Vane, the next day Mr. Winthrop protested against placing the colors on the fort; but, seconded by Mr. Dudley and Mr. Cotton, the Governor adhered to his original determination, and the colors were displayed.[1]

The controversy with Mrs. Hutchinson will be noticed hereafter. The part taken in this controversy by Mr. Vane, joined to other causes of dissatisfaction, so far excited the opposition of his associates, that before the expiration of the year he was inclined to throw up his office and return home; but by the persuasion of his friends he was dissuaded from taking that step, and remained at his post.[2]

May, 1637.

The annual election in the following year took place in the midst of difficulties. The controversy with Mrs. Hutchinson was at its height; and those who condemned her as a heretic, were determined upon the suppression of her "errors," or her expulsion from the colony with all her adherents. It was, therefore, a time of the intensest excitement; a tumult was feared; fierce speeches were bandied about; Mr. Wilson himself, the pastor of the Boston

[1] Winthrop, 1. 225; Hubbard, 241–2.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 247–8; Mass. Rec's., 1. 185; Hubbard, 256–7.— Hutchinson, 1. 142, suggests that Mr. Winthrop "might have some political views mixed with this instance of his zeal."

church, harangued the electors from a tree into which he climbed; and there was rash laying on of hands among some of the disputants.[1] Voting by proxy being allowed, the election was warmly contested; but the result, after a close siege, was the choice of John Winthrop, for Governor, and Thomas Dudley, for Deputy; and Messrs. Stoughton and Saltonstall, were "called to be Assistants,"—Mr. Vane, Mr. Coddington, and Mr. Dummer being "left quite out." Pilate and Herod became friends that day. Orthodoxy of religious opinion took the precedence of political orthodoxy; and Messrs. Endicott and Stoughton were relieved of the disabilities in which their heresy on the latter point had involved them, and restored because of their soundness and zeal on the former.[2] CHAP. VIII.

Once more in the chair, Mr. Winthrop continued in office, with the exception of four years, until his death. These exceptions were in 1640, and 1645, when Thomas Dudley was Governor; in 1641, when Richard Bellingham held the office; and in 1644, when it was held by John Endicott. In the many important events which transpired during this period, Mr. Winthrop bore his part with fidelity and discretion. In his participation in the controversies of the day, it is but just to remark that he seems to have been actuated not so much by bigotry, or a love of persecution, as by a conviction of duty. He regretted the harshness with which Roger Williams was treated; and though a zealous opponent of Mrs. Hutchinson, and the enthusiastic Gorton, as he advanced in life his spirit became more catholic, and he lamented the errors of the past; so that when urged by Mr. Dudley to sign an order for the banishment of 1640 to 1649.

[1] Savage, on Winthrop, 1. 262; Mass. Rec's., 1. 188; Hubbard, 258–9. This custom was established Mar. 9. 1636–7, and not the previous December, as Mr. Savage states.

[2] Mass. Rec's., 1. 135, 136, 175, 195; Winthrop, 186, 190.

CHAP. VIII. one deemed heterodox, he replied: "I have done enough of that work already."[1]

Of the numerous emigrations to the colony in the earlier years of its existence, we have spoken in the preceding chapter. Over twenty thousand persons are estimated to have arrived in New England in the fifteen years before the assembling of the Long Parliament; one hundred and ninety-eight ships bore them over the Atlantic; and the whole cost of their transportation, and of the establishment of the plantation, is computed at about £200,000, or nearly a million of dollars.[2] The progress of settlement had been
1634. proportionally rapid. Wood, in his New England's Prospect, names "Wessaguscus, Mount Wollaston, Dorchester, Roxbury, Boston, Muddy-river, Charles Towne, Medford, Newtown, Watertowne, Misticke, Winnisimet, Saugus, Salem, Marvill Head, Agowamme, and Merrimacke," as "all the towns which were begun when he came for England," and of each he gives a brief description.[3] But when Josselyn states that, in 1638, Boston was but "a village rather than a town, there being not above twenty or thirty houses,"[4] although his account has been since unsuspiciously copied by almost every writer on the early history of the state, we incline to the opinion that the vision of the renowned voyager was afflicted with such obliquity, that he could see only the statelier edifices, inhabited by the magistrates, while the humbler dwellings, rudely constructed of

[1] Savage, on Winthrop, 1. 213; Bishop's N. E. Judged, 226; Hutchinson, 1. 142.—Bishop says this was Marmaduke Matthews, of whom see 3 M. H. Coll., 1. 29–32.

[2] Johnson, in 2 M. H. Coll., 2. 77, 81; Josselyn, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 381; Dummer's Def. Charter; Hutchinson, 1. 91. Some authorities say two hundred and ninety-eight vessels; others one hundred and ninety-eight; Johnson gives both, and the smaller is probably the correct number.—Vincent, in 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 42, computes the population of Mass. and Ct. in 1637, at 30,000. The "Brief Relation," p. 4, in Force, vol. 4. Tract 11, speaks of but 4,000 persons embarking for America in the first twelve years. Probably it should be *families*.

[3] Chron. Mass., chap. xx; Winthrop, 1. 34, 43, 44, 45, 49, 51, 69, 83, 85, 86, 105, 109, 111, 141, 147, 157, &c.; Hubbard, 158.

[4] In 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 325.

the rough logs of the forest, and tenanted by as warm hearts and as clear heads as dwelt beneath costlier roofs, were wholly overlooked by one who saw little in such modest abodes worthy the notice of so distinguished a personage! CHAP. VIII.

Hingham was settled in 1634.[1] Newbury, Concord, and Dedham were incorporated in 1635.[2] And from that date to 1643, acts were passed incorporating Lynn, North Chelsea, Salisbury, Rowley, Sudbury, Braintree, Woburn, Gloucester, Haverhill, Wenham, and Hull.[3] West of Worcester, the only town incorporated within the present limits of the State was Springfield, for which an act was passed in 1636.[4] These little municipalities were, in a measure, peculiar to New England; each was sovereign within itself; each sustained a relation to the whole, analogous to that which the States of our Union hold respectively to the central power, or the constitution of the United States; and the idea of the formation of such communities was probably derived from the parishes of England, for each town was a parish, and each, as it was incorporated, was required to contribute to the maintenance of the ministry, as the basis of its grant of municipal rights.[5] Four counties were erected at this time: Suffolk, Essex, Middlesex, and Old Norfolk, all which were incorporated in 1643. Each of the first three contained eight towns, and Old Norfolk six.[6] 1634 to 1643.

Strange as it may now seem, before 1635 complaints were heard in some towns that "the people were straitened for want of room." Particularly were these complaints heard at Dorchester and Newtown; and the result was the

[1] Winthrop, 1. 171; Lincoln's Hist. H'm., and Bi-Cent. Address.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 191, 200; Coffin's Newbury, Shattuck's Concord, Worthington's Dedham, &c.

[3] Winthrop, and the Col. Rec's. Only a portion of these towns have local histories: all should have.

[4] Winthrop, and the Col. Rec's.; Hubbard, 308; Hutchinson, 1. 95; Trumbull, 1. 57.

[5] Baylies, 1. 241; Frothingham's Chas'n., 49, 50; and the Petitions and Acts for incorporating different towns.

[6] Mass. Rec's., 2. 38; Hutchinson, 1. 112; N. E. Gen. Reg.

CHAP. VIII.

settlement of Connecticut. The Plymouth people, in their trade with the Dutch, had learned of the existence of the beautiful Connecticut, known as the Fresh River, and it had been commended to them as a "fine place for habitation and trade;" but their hands being then full, no use

April, 1631. was made of this knowledge until some time after, when a company of Indians, driven out by the Pequots, visited Plymouth, and solicited a party to be sent to "set up a trading house;" and their circumstances permitting, they "began to send that way," to discover the country, and to "trade with the natives." The same Indians visited Boston to ask help from the Massachusetts Colony; but, suspicious of their intentions, their proposals were declined.

June, 1633. Nearly two years later, a trading pinnace from Plymouth put in at Manhattan, and learning that the Dutch purposed erecting a fort "twenty leagues up the" Connecticut, Mr. Winslow and Governor Bradford journeyed to Boston to obtain aid to defeat this project; but the people of the Bay, through jealousy or some other cause, refused to interfere.[1]

July 12, 1633. The messengers, on receiving this answer, intimated their intention to proceed on their own responsibility; and return-

July 18. Oct. ing to Plymouth, a party was sent, under William Holmes, to take possession of the country, and erect suitable buildings. Here they were met by the Dutch, who had already purchased land of the natives and thrown up a slight entrenchment at Hartford, and commanded to withdraw; but taking no notice of this command, they pushed on, and at the mouth of Little's river laid the foundation of Windsor, fortifying their house with a strong palisade. The Dutch, little pleased with this movement, and claiming the country as as appanage of New Netherland, sent to Manhattan, and seventy men, well armed, with colors displayed,

[1] Winthrop, 1. 125; Morton's Mem., 89, 90; Hubbard, 170; Morton, App., 395; 29; Davis's Brodheads's New York, 237–8, 240, Hutchinson, 1. 148; Trumbull, 1.

came to drive out the intruders; but finding their strength, and that blood must be shed in the contest, the assailants, after a futile demonstration, prudently withdrew, and "proposed a parley."[1]

Previous to this, at the instance, it is supposed, of Sir Richard Saltonstall, who had crossed over from America to England, the fee of the soil of Connecticut, which is said to have been purchased of the Council for New England by the Earl of Warwick,[2] was transferred to Lord Say and Seal, Lord Brook, John Hampden, and others, who held it as his assigns. The people of New Plymouth, however, were the first English who settled the country, and they, with the Dutch, who had erected at Hartford the "House of Good Hope," were its only white occupants in 1633. As both the Dutch and the Pilgrims claimed to be lawful proprietors of the soil, and as the grantees under the Earl of Warwick had issued commissions to the eldest son of Governor Winthrop, to make entrance and occupy the territory,[3] controversies between the rival claimants seemed inevitable; and the Massachusetts Colony became involved in these controversies, in consequence of the removal of the inhabitants of Dorchester to Mitteneag, now Windsor, where the Plymouth people had erected their trading house.[4]

Mar. 19, 1631-2.

July 7, and 15, 1635.

The removals from Massachusetts were effected as follows: — The inhabitants of Newtown, who had for some time complained of "want of room," asked permission to remove to Connecticut, but were refused, on the "proca-

[1] Winthrop, 1. 134, 182; Bradford, in Prince; Morton's Mem., 90; Hubbard, 172; Hazard, 2. 262; Trumbull, 1. 33-6; Brodhead's New York, 232-242.

[2] Chalmers, Ann., 299, and Brodhead, N. Yk., 211, doubt whether the Earl of Warwick ever received a grant of Ct.; but it is historically true that he issued a patent to Lord Say and others, in March 1631-2, which may be seen in Trumbull, 1. 495-6.

[3] Winthrop, 1. 202-3, 207; Gardiner, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3, 137; Trumbull, 1. 27, 60, 497-8.

[4] Winthrop, 1. 198, 216; Hubbard, 179; Trumbull, 1. 60, 65.

CHAP. VIII.

tarctic" plea that their strength was needed at home. Soon after, a messenger from the Indians visited Boston,

Sept., 1631. and offered all their rights at Connecticut, if a plantation should be erected there; but the Pequots having murdered Captain Stone and his crew, the Massachusetts people first demanded satisfaction for this murder, after which a treaty

June, 1635. of peace was to be concluded. A little later, a bark of Sir Richard Saltonstall's arrived at Boston, which was sent

May 6. "to plant at Connecticut;" and a party from Dorchester having made an overland journey to the "New Hesperia," and settled at Windsor, there they were located when Mr. Saltonstall's bark arrived.[1] These emigrants from Dor-

Oct. 15. chester were followed the same fall by about sixty men, women and children, from Newtown, who, taking their journey late in the season, were unable to make suitable provisions for winter, which set in so early, and with such severity, that no supplies could reach them by the river. Hence their cattle perished in great numbers; and the emigrants suffered such privations, that many of them abandoned their homes, and waded through the snow to the sea-board, nearly perishing in the attempt; and some journeying by land, and others taking passage in the Rebecca,

Dec., 1635. they returned to Boston, leaving a few of their companions behind, who braved out the severities of the season, subsisting on acorns, malt, and grains.[2]

May 31, 1636. Late in the ensuing spring, when nature was radiant with beauty, and the leaves and grass were sufficiently grown for the cattle to browse, Mr. Hooker, Mr. Stone, and most of the congregation of Newtown, set out for Connecti-

[1] Winthrop, 1. 192, 198; Morton's Mem., 92–3, 97; Hubbard, 172–5, 179, 307; 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 42–3; 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 132; Trumbull, 1. 60; Brodhead's N. Y., 257.—Hubbard suggests that *jealousy* had something to do with this removal, for "two such eminent stars, such as were Mr. Cotton and Mr. Hooker, both of the first magnitude, though of different influence, could not well continue in one and the same orb."

[2] Winthrop, 1. 204, 207, 208, 219; Hubbard, 307–8; Trumbull, 1. 60–3.

cut; the pastor's wife being borne in a horse-litter, in consequence of her feebleness. The party was composed of about one hundred emigrants, men, women and children, some of whom had lived in opulence and comfort in England; and, taking with them one hundred and sixty cattle, upon whose milk they subsisted by the way, they toiled on, through the pathless forests of the interior of Massachusetts, with the compass for their guide, having no pillow but Jacob's, and no canopy but the heavens. Mr. Haynes, late Governor of Massachusetts, was one of this party; and advancing scarce ten miles a day, o'er mountain top, and hill and stream, through tangled woods and dismal swamps, it was a fortnight ere they reached their haven of rest.[1] In the fall of the same year, the church at Dorchester, under Mr. Warham, removed to Windsor;[2] and a band from Watertown settled at Wethersfield.[3] Sept.

The same summer, a commission was sent to John Winthrop, Jr., to treat with the Pequots for the murder of Capt. Stone, and his companion, Capt. Norton; and if they refused reparation, the presents they had sent the colonists were to be returned, accompanied by a protest equivalent to a declaration of war.[4] This formidable tribe, the central seat of whose power was between the Mystic and the Thames, was able to muster at least seven hundred warriors; and if their feelings towards the English were ever friendly, they were soon changed to those of hatred and revenge.[5] July 4, 1636.

Others, however, besides the Pequots, had tasted the blood of the English. John Oldham, whose name has often occurred in these pages, and who had become a resident of the Massachusetts Colony, was murdered by a party of July 20, 1636.

[1] Winthrop, 1. 223, 468; Hutchinson, 1. 48; Trumbull, 1. 25, 64–5.
[2] Hubbard, 307; Trumbull, 1. 65.
[3] Hubbard, 307; Trumbull, 1. 23, 59, 65.
[4] 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 129–31.
[5] Prince, Chronol.; 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 122–3; Gookin, in 1. M. H. Coll., 1; Trumbull, 1. 41–2; Miss Caulkin's Hist. N. London, 19–20.

CHAP. VIII. 1636. Block Island Indians, his vessel was robbed, and two boys were taken captives; and Roger Williams, then settled at Providence, having inquired into the affair, Indian messengers were sent by Canonicus, with a letter to Governor Vane from Mr. Williams, acquainting him with the particulars of this terrible tragedy.[1] The magistrates, subjecting to a rigid examination an Indian prisoner, he alleged that "all the sachems of the Narragansets, except Canonicus and Miantonomo," were the contrivers of Oldham's death, and that the messengers were *particeps criminis;* but, as Canonicus and Miantonomo were exerting themselves to capture the assassins, and the latter for that purpose had gone to Block Island with two-hundred men, the Governor prudently deferred further action until the matter was more fully investigated; and writing to Mr. Williams for the return of the two boys, and to Canonicus to assist in the arrest of the murderers, a deputation to the latter chief was sent shortly after,[2] who, on their return, reported that he disclaimed being leagued with the murderers, and offered his services, upon "safe and wary conditions," to aid in their arrest.

Aug. 8. Aug. 13.

This murder prompted to action; and, as the magistrates and ministers were in its favor, an expedition to Block Island was at once set on foot. Volunteers for the service presented themselves in great numbers; and selecting eighty or ninety of the most resolute,[3] who were placed under John Endicott, Esq., as General, and distributed into four companies, under Capts. John Underhill, and Nathan-

[1] Winthrop, 1. 225–7; Morton's Mem., 98–9; Hubbard, 248–50; Underhill, in 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 4. Prince and Trumbull mistake in saying Oldham was murdered in 1635.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 229; 2. 423; Hubbard, 251; Johnson, in 2 M. H. Coll., 7. 76–7.

[3] Hutchinson, 1. 60, says eighty; Hubbard, 251, says eighty or ninety; Winthrop, 1. 229, says ninety, and 1. 231, he says eighty, beside the officers; Underhill, 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 4, says one hundred; Mason, 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 131, and Niles, 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 162, say one hundred and twenty.

iel Turner, and Ensigns William Jennison and Richard Davenport, they were embarked in three pinnaces, taking two Indians with them as guides and interpreters. By their commission, they were to "put to death the men of Block Island, but to spare the women and children; and from thence to go to the Pequots to demand the murderers of Captain Stone and other English, and one thousand fathoms of wampum for damages, and some of their children as hostages, which, if they should refuse, they were to obtain it by force."[1] CHAP. VIII. 1636.

Armed with these extraordinary powers, the fleet set sail, and in a few days reached Block Island, where, after a slight skirmish with the natives, who "entertained them with arrows," but were treated with balls in return, the party landed, and spent the two following days in ravaging the island, destroying wigwams, canoes, and corn; and having "slain some fourteen and wounded others," they sailed for Saybrook, at the mouth of the Connecticut.[2] August 21 or 25. Aug. 31

Here they were not very cordially received. The authorities of Connecticut and Plymouth thought the expedition ill-advised,[3] and one of the Massachusetts writers acknowledges it to have been a bootless voyage.[4] Finding, however, that Mr. Endicott was bent upon proceeding, Lieut. Gardiner, the commander of the fort, furnished him with boats and men; and setting out in "five vessels," the party entered the Pequot river, now the Thames, and "parleyed" with the natives; but not satisfied with their apologies, the troops landed, and here, as at Block Island, commenced the work of devastation, destroying wigwams, canoes, and corn; and leaving the men furnished by Gardiner to

[1] Winthrop, 1. 229–30; Hubbard, 252; Mason, 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 131; Underhill, 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 4.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 231–2, 238; Underhill, 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 6–7; Trumbull, 1. 72–3.

[3] Winslow, in Winthrop, 1. 238; Trumbull, 1. 77.

[4] Johnson in 2 M. H. Coll.

[5] Winthrop, 1. 232; Gardiner, 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 141; Underhill, 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 7.

CHAP. VIII. shift for themselves, the victors, flushed with success, returned safe to Boston, "which was a marvellous providence of God, that not a hair fell from the head of any of them, nor any sick or feeble person among them."[1]

Sep. 14, 1636.

Very soon rumors were rife, that the Pequots and Narragansets were at truce, and that the former were plying the latter with the most powerful of all arguments — self-preservation — to join them in exterminating the English. It was a critical time. The danger seemed imminent. In this sad extremity, the chief hope of the colonists lay in the intercession of Mr. Williams, whose influence with the Narragansets was known to be great. But would one whom they had expelled from their midst under circumstances of such ignominy, interfere in their behalf? It marks the magnanimous nature of the exile, that he hesitated not for a moment to proffer his aid. "Putting his life in his hands" — for the enterprise was extremely hazardous — and scarce acquainting his wife with his intentions, he embarked alone, in a frail canoe, and cut through a "stormy wind, with great seas," to the house of Canonicus. The Pequot ambassadors were there before him; and for three nights and days he was forced to mix with them, hourly expecting their knives at his throat. But "God wonderfully preserved him, and helped him to break in pieces the Pequots negotiations and designs;" and shortly after Miantonomo, and two of the sons of Canonicus, came to Boston, and in the presence of the magistrates and ministers signed a league of peace and alliance.[2]

Oct. 21.

The result of the expedition to Block Island was only to exasperate the Indians, who, thirsting for revenge, "set out upon a course of greater insolence than before, and

[1] Winthrop, 1. 232–3, 235; Gardiner, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 141; Underhill, in 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 11; Mass. Rec's., 1., 88.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 236–8; Williams's Lett., in 1 M. H. Coll., 1. 277, and 3 M. H. Coll., 1. 159; Trumbull, 1. 74–6.

slew all they found in their way." At Saybrook, they dared the garrison to fight; and one Samuel Butterfield being out with others to gather hay, he was taken prisoner, and roasted alive.[1] Two weeks later, five or six others were attacked, and most of them wounded. And in the winter, Lieut. Gardiner, with nine or ten men, having ventured out to burn weeds, was drawn into an ambuscade, and two of his men were slain.[2] Supposing Gardiner was also killed, the Indians invested the fort, and jeeringly cried to the inmates, "Come and fetch your Englishmen's clothes! Come out and fight, if you dare! You dare not fight! You are all like women!" But Capt. Mason, the warrior of the colony, who had fought in the Netherlands under Sir Thomas Fairfax, being sent to their relief, the besiegers were repelled; and by the arrival of Capt. Underhill, from Massachusetts, the company was so strengthened that the Indians withdrew, and passing up to Wethersfield, a body of two hundred fell upon the town, slew nine men, women and children, and took two maids captives, who were subsequently redeemed by the Dutch.[3] Probably about the same time, John Tilly was seized, tied to a stake, flayed alive, hot embers were thrust into his flesh, and his hands and feet were cut off, in which mutilated condition he lingered three days.

CHAP. VIII. Oct. 1636. Feb. 22, 1636-7. Mar. 1 April, 1637. Apr. 23.

This succession of tragedies spread alarm throughout the colonies; and, thoroughly aroused to the necessity of strik- May 1.

[1] Winthrop, 1. 236; Gardiner, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 142–3; Underhill, in 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 11; Hubbard, 252; Drake's Boston, 203.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 252; Gardiner, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 142–3; Underhill, in 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 11; Trumbull, 1. 76.

[3] Winthrop, 1. 260, 266–7; Mason, in 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 123, 132; Gardiner, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 146; Underhill, in 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 12, 17, 19; Vincent, in ibid., 35.—Mr. Drake, Hist. Bos'n., 206, mistakes in saying Gov. Haynes, from whom the Mass. people heard of this tragedy, left Boston. Ap. 3. He left May 2, and May 12 his letter was received. Winthrop, 1. 260.

[4] Winthrop, 1. 238, and Trumbull, 1. 75, date the murder of Tilley in Oct., 1636; but both Gardiner and Underhill place it after the Wethersfield affair.

CHAP. VIII.

ing a more effectual blow, a court was convened at Hartford, and immediate war was decreed. But the settlements were weak. There were probably not more than three hundred white men in all in Connecticut at this time; and out of this number, but ninety could be spared for the war. The command of such of these as could be readily mustered, was given to Capt. John Mason, who received his staff of office from the hands of Mr. Hooker; and Uncas, with about eighty of his Mohegan warriors joining him, Fort Saybrook was made their rendezvous; but before Mason arrived here, the Mohegans, who had landed, as a test of their fidelity sent out scouts and took several prisoners.[1]

May 10, 1637.

May 15.

The vessels being wind-bound at Saybrook, a council was held; and although the instructions to Capt. Mason were, to proceed at once to the Pequot river, it was resolved to sail first to Narraganset Bay, and thence march overland to the attack, that the Indians might be taken by surprise; and immediately setting sail, the next day the party arrived at their destined port, and there spent the Sabbath.[3] The Pequots, seeing these vessels sail past the Thames, were completely blinded; and thinking the English had abandoned their design, they sent up shouts of joy, and despatching runners to call in their people, they prepared to hold a grand festival to commemorate their deliverance.

May 17 to 19.

May 20.

May 21.

Meanwhile Mason's troops steadily pursued their course; and after holding an interview with Miantonomo, who was chary of his offers, the little army, numbering less than

May 23.

[1] Winthrop, 1. 266–7; Mason, in 2 M. H. Coll, 8. 132–3; Gardiner, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 148–9; Underhill, in 3. M. H. Coll., 6. 15–16; Vincent, in ibid., 3. 36; Trumbull, 1. 79–80. The latter says the troops arrived at Saybrook on the 15th; but Mason says on Wednesday, the 17th. The Mohegan sortie was probably made on the 15th, as in the text.

[2] Mason, in 2 M. H. Coll., 8 135. We give the preference to the narrative of Mason here, because he was a participant in the war, and the best competent, perhaps, to give an authentic account.

eighty English, and about as many Mohegans, set out to meet four times that number of Pequot warriors. Nothing daunted, however, they marched to Niantick, some twenty miles distant; and quartering there for the night, the next day they were joined by a lage body of Narragansets and Nianticks, numbering towards five hundred. At eight o'clock the march was resumed; and fording the Pawcatuck, twelve miles from their rendezvous, notwithstanding the warmth of the weather they pressed on, and after nightfall encamped near a swamp, between two hills, on land now in Groton, about two miles from Fort Mistic, where the Pequots had assembled to hold their festival, aided by the light of a brilliant moon, and where their shouts of revelry were heard, pealing upon the air until midnight, when all was quiet.[1]

CHAP. VIII.

May 24, 1637.

May 25.

On the morrow, ere the first blush of daylight tinged the East, the troops were roused; and guided by Wequash, a Pequot deserter, they threaded their way to the foot of a hill, and the fort stood before them! Although the Mohegans remained firm, most of the other Indians had fled; and the rest were only detained by the assurance of Capt. Mason that they should receive no harm; that the English alone would enter the fort; and that they might surround it, to seize such as escaped.

Friday, May 26.

As there were two entrances to the fort, at different points, Capt. Mason advanced upon one, and Capt. Underhill upon the other. Drawing near the palisade, by the barking of a dog the first alarm was conveyed to the doomed Pequots; and their sentinel shouting, "Owanux! Owanux!" — English! English! — a volley of shot was poured through the openings, and Mason, wheeling his platoon, fell upon the main entrance, which was blocked

[1] Compare the accounts of Mason, Vincent, and others, in the M. H. Coll. There are, as usual, discrepant details, which we have sought to reconcile.

CHAP. VIII. 1638.

with bushes about breast high, and pressing them aside entered the enclosure. The cries of the Pequots, who were completely at bay, touched the hearts of some; but remembering the blood they had shed, and their cruelty to their captives, they "hardened their hearts, and stopped their ears;" and adopting the motto that "mercy mars all sometimes, and severe justice must now and then take place," the attack was continued. The space within was crowded with wigwams, sixty or seventy in number, covering a space of one or two acres;[1] and the savages, had they not been paralyzed by the suddenness of the onslaught, might easily have repelled the invaders. As it was, both Capt. Mason and his troops were near being overcome; and finding a different course must be adopted, a brand was seized, and the wigwams were fired. This decided the battle. The flames rolled on with terrific speed, crackling and flashing upon the stillness of the morning air, and mingled with shouts, and groans of agonizing despair, as body after body disappeared and was consumed. The savages without

"Doubly redoubled strokes upon the foe,"

and shot down all who attempted to escape, or made prisoners of such as could be seized; and in a little more than an hour's time, the strife was over! Several hundred Indians perished by the sword or the flames; seven only escaped; seven were taken prisoners. It was a fatal blow to the Pequots, for the flower of their strength was gone.

Ere the sun was an hour high, the whole work ended; and the conquerors, retreating to their vessels, which had been ordered to sail into the harbor, were beset on their

[1] Underhill, 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 23, note, says the fort covered but one acre of ground. Vincent, in ibid., 38, says two acres. Some modern authorities say twenty acres; but the Indians never enclosed so large a space, and the Narraganset fort, in 1676, in which were five hundred wigwams, covered but five or six acres.

march by a body of about three hundred warriors, under Sassacus, advancing from their second fort, confident of success. What was their horror at beholding the smouldering ruins, strewn with crisped bodies, blackened and disfigured! Frantic with rage, they rushed madly on, stamping, and yelling, and tearing their hair. But all was in vain! The victors escaped; and their arrival at Hartford was hailed with rejoicing. CHAP. VIII. 1637.

"It may be demanded," says one of the actors, "Why should you be so furious? Why should not Christians have more mercy and compassion?" But his summary reply is: "I would refer you to David's war. Sometimes the Scripture declareth women and children must perish with their parents. We had sufficient light from the word of God for our proceedings."[1]

The appeals of Connecticut for aid from the Bay, were answered as promptly as circumstances would permit; but the settlers at Plymouth more reluctantly proffered their services, owing to difficulties between them and the Massachusetts colonists. A negotiation for the adjustment of these difficulties was appointed, and the interview was held at Boston, two weeks before the attack upon fort Mistic; May 12. but it was not until nearly a month after that Plymouth June 5. consented to furnish her quota, and then the war was nearly ended.[2]

The Massachusetts colonists, having heard, through Miantonomo, that the Pequots had sent their women and children to an island for safety, sent forty men, under Capt. Patrick, of Watertown, with whom Miantonomo and sixteen of his warriors were to join, and "in the night set upon them;" and these troops reached Providence two days before the May 21. attack on Fort Mistic, and proceeding thence to Narra-

[1] See the narratives of Mason, Underhill, Vincent, Gardiner, &c., in the M. H. Coll., and comp. Winthrop, Hutchinson, Trumbull, &c.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 260, 270; Winslow, in Hutch. Coll., 60–1; Drake's Boston, 210.

CHAP. VIII

ganset, they embarked in the vessels which had conveyed Capt. Mason's troops thither, and arrived at the Pequot river in season to receive the successful combatants.[1]

Apr. 18, 1637. Besides these forty men, it had been agreed to raise one hundred and twenty more, who were to be placed under Capt. Israel Stoughton, of Dorchester, with Mr. Wilson, of

May 17. Boston, as chaplain; and at a later date, an order was passed for raising "fifty men more to be sent forth with Capt. Stoughton," and a committee was appointed to proportion them upon the towns, and to have them in readiness to march within ten days, if possible.[2] But in the meantime, a rumor having reached Boston that all the English and the Indians had been cut off in the retreat from Fort Mistic, which rumor was confirmed by a post from Plymouth, the movement of the troops was delayed, until word arrived from Roger Williams that the army was safe, and that "all the Pequots were fled, and had forsaken their forts."[3]

June 3. Upon this intelligence the troops were marched; but before their arrival the Pequots, conscious that their doom was sealed, had used all diligence to secrete themselves.[4] Capt. Stoughton pursued a feeble and half-famished party of a hundred, and surprised them all, putting to death twenty-two men, and sending the rest, women and children, as prisoners to Boston.[5] After this, uniting with Capt. Mason, the main body of the fugitives was pursued.

July. These fled to a swamp, which was surrounded; nearly two hundred "old men, women and children" were taken pris-

[1] Mass. Rec's., 1. 192; Winthrop, 1. 265–6; Mason, in 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 143–4; Underhill, in 3 M. H. 6. 28.

[2] Mass. Rec's., 192–3, 195, 197.

[3] Winthrop, 1, 269; Mason, in 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 145; Trumbull, 1. 81–2.

[4] Winthrop, 1. 269–70, Mason, in 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 145; Underhill, in 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 28.—Gardiner, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 150, represents Stoughton's army as consisting of three hundred men.

[5] Winthrop, 1. 277–8; Trumbull, 1. 82; Hist. N. London, 37. See also the Letter of Stoughton, in Hutch. Coll., 61–3.

oners, and a large number of warriors were slain;[1] and on the return of the Massachusetts troops, a day of thanksgiving was ordered to be observed, and the soldiers were to be "feasted" by their several towns.[2] CHAP. VIII. Oct. 12, 1637.

Thus ended the Pequot war; and thenceforth the remnant of the tribe "became a prey to all Indians; and happy were they that could bring in their heads to the English: of which there came almost daily to Windsor or Hartford. But the Pequots growing weary hereof, sent some of the chief that survived to mediate with the English; offering that if they might but enjoy their lives, they would become the English vassals, to dispose of them as they pleased; which was granted them. Whereupon Onkos and Miantonomo were sent for; who with the Pequots met at Hartford. The Pequots being demanded how many of them were living? answered, about one hundred and eighty, or two hundred. There were then given to Onkos, Sachem of Moheag, eighty; to Miantonomo, Sachem of Narragansett, eighty; and to Nynigrett, twenty."[3] Yet afterwards, parties were attacked, and their numbers still further reduced.[4] Sep. 21, 1638.

For three years there was peace. The Indians had seen enough to convince them of the prowess of the English, and were little inclined to test further their strength in a general war. At length their courage began to revive, and letters were received, from Plymouth and Connecticut, stating that there was reason to apprehend a general design of the Indians against the English. Miantonomo was supposed to be the instigator of this design; and it was alleged, that he had violated the tripartite league of 1638, 1640.

[1] Winthrop, 1. 279; Johnson, in 2 M. H. Coll., 4. 49–51; Mason, in 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 146–8; Gardiner, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 150–1; Morton's Mem.; Trumbull, 1. 83–5.

[2] Mass. Rec's., 1. 200, 204; Morton's Mem., 99–106.

[3] Mason, in 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 148–9.

[4] Trumbull, 1. 92–3, 112–13.

CHAP. VIII.

and sent presents to the Mohawks to secure their co-operation. The magistrates of the colony at first discredited these reports; but not knowing how much foundation they might have, it was deemed prudent to "strengthen the watches in all the towns," and Capt. Jennison, with three men and an Indian interpreter, was sent to the Narragansets to "know the truth of their intentions." These messengers were "kindly entertained;" but Miantonomo, with true Indian pride, refused to speak with Capt. Jennison in the presence of the interpreter, "because he was a Pequod;" and "making use of another," he denied all confederation with the Mohawks, and professed his purpose to continue friendship with the English, and not use any hostility against them "except they began."

Being desired to visit Boston, he readily promised to do so, "if Mr. Williams might accompany him;" but Janemoh, the Niantick Sachem, "carried himself proudly, and refused to come to us, or to yield to anything, only he said he would not harm us, except we invaded him."[1]

1641. The occurrence of this incident, and their fears lest the Indians might rise against the English, seems to have given birth to a movement on the part of Massachusetts, which contemplated the entire "rooting out" of the aborigines, as "of the cursed race of Ham;" but the magistrates of Rhode Island and Connecticut humanely expressed their dislike to the project, and their desire to gain the natives "by justice and kindness," and yet "withal to watch over them to prevent any danger;" and Massachusetts was constrained to return an answer of "consent in all things propounded," only they "refused to conclude those of Aquiday in their answer, or to have any treaty with them."[2]

Sept. 1, 1642. In the following year, the charge of a general conspiracy

[1] Winthrop, 2. 9, 18–19; Hubbard's Narr., 5–6.

[2] Winthrop, 2. 24, and Mr. Savage's note. Also Mass. Rec's.

was renewed, and the Bay people were advised to send a body of troops to the mouth of the Connecticut, to join others and carry the war into the enemy's camp. It is probable that the difficulties between the Dutch and the Indians gave rise to these rumors; and it must be acknowledged that, as the Dutch had, for a long time, bartered arms for peltry, and furnished the natives with a large number of muskets, the prospect of a collision was really alarming.[1]

CHAP. VIII. 1642.

Upon the receipt of this intelligence, the nearest magistrates were convened, and a general court was agreed to be held in six days; and, as a prudential step, the neighboring Indians were disarmed. At the meeting of this court, orders for the more strict observance of military discipline were passed; and it was concluded to send two messengers to Miantonomo, to inform him of the rumors which were circulating, and to desire satisfaction.[2] These messengers were courteously received; rational answers were returned to all their propositions; and the chieftain promised personally to visit Boston.

Sep. 8.

On his arrival, an interview was held; and the Governor acting as spokesman, in "all his answers" the Indian prince was "very deliberate, and showed good understanding in the principles of justice and equity, and ingenuity withal." His first demand was to be confronted with his accusers; but this demand was refused, on the plea that his accusers were not known; the reports were only general; and they had preferred to give him a hearing before fully crediting the same. "If you did not credit the reports," was his reply, "why did you disarm the Indians?" "For our security," was the answer. The Indian chief was a shrewd diplomatist. Treating the report as a calumny of

[1] Winthrop, 2. 95, Brodhead's N. Yk.

[2] Mass. Rec's., 2. 23–4; Winthrop, 2. 95–9; Hutchinson, 1. 108.

CHAP. VIII.

Uncas, he offered to meet him face to face, and prove his treachery; seemed greatly grieved that his honesty should be called in question; and urged that his slanderers should be suitably punished. Nearly two days were spent in this discussion; but in conclusion, he "accommodated himself to the satisfaction of the court, and was dismissed with presents."

It was but a few days, however, before fresh tidings came from Connecticut, asserting the intention of the people there to commence a war; but a new meeting of the magistrates being held, letters were forwarded to dissuade them from their purpose; and gradually the fears of the people subsided, and quiet was restored.[1]

July, 1643.

In the following year, a war broke out between Uncas, the Mohegan chief, and Sequasson of Connecticut. Miantonomo took the part of the latter, complained of the conduct of Uncas to the colonial magistrates, and requested permission to redress the wrongs of his confederate, which was granted. Raising an army of a thousand warriors, he attacked Uncas, whose men numbered but three or four hundred; but with such ill-success that he was defeated and taken prisoner. The news of his capture reaching Providence, Gorton, of Warwick, demanded his release; but taking his prisoner to Hartford, Uncas left him with the magistrates until his fate could be decided.

Sept. 7.

At the meeting of the commissioners of the United Colonies at Boston, his case came up for discussion. The magistrates were in a dilemma. It was their unanimous opinion that it would not be safe to liberate him, yet they had not sufficient grounds to condemn him to death. In this emergency, to shift the responsibility from their own shoulders, the advice of the clergy was asked, and "all agreed that he ought to be put to death." He was accord-

[1] Winthrop, 2. 95–102.

ingly delivered up to Uncas; two Englishmen were sent to see that he was executed; and as soon as the Mohegan sachem reached his own jurisdiction, at a given signal the chieftain was attacked from behind, and with a blow from a tomahawk was killed![1] CHAP. VIII. 1643.

If by the "pleading of an advocate"[2] and the "opinion of a judge,"[3] the course of the commissioners and the clergy is unqualifiedly condemned, we should hardly have looked for an apology from a reputable divine.[4] Policy may have prompted this step, but was it in accordance with Christianity? Well might the people of Rhode Island mourn the fate of Miantonomo, and drop a tear on his ashes, for he and Canonicus were the best aboriginal friends and benefactors their colony ever knew.[5] Nor need we be surprised that the death of the chief enkindled the resentment of his tribe, and that difficulties with the Narragansets were often occurring. Yet such was the power of the English, and such was the weakness of the Indians, that the latter were generally subdued; nor was it until after the lapse of thirty years, that any signal disturbance spread terror throughout all the settlements. There was peace for a generation, won by the sword.

We cannot, however, forbear remarking, in closing this narrative of the earlier Indian wars, that, had the conduct of our fathers been less retaliatory, we should perhaps have been spared the necessity of reflecting upon the correctness of their policy; nor would the pages of history have been stained with the sickening details of heads, scalps, hands and feet, as trophies of conquest. But we bear in mind the difference between those days and ours. Such cruelties

[1] Winthrop, 2. 157–162; Hutchinson, 1. 130–2, and Coll, 142; Hubbard's Narr., 6; Trumbull, 1. 130–3.

[2] Savage, on Winthrop, 2. 159.

[3] Davis, on Morton.

[4] Holmes, Ann., 1. 272.

[5] Hopkins, in M. H. Coll., 9. 202; Haynes, in 3 M. H. Coll., 1. 229; Staples, Ann. Prov., 51–4.

CHAP. VIII.

were common then; and the demon of War, like the idol Moloch, was gorged with its victims, until rivers of blood reddened the earth. Yet even in the nineteenth century, with all its light, cruelties as great have been practised by Christians of all sects; nor is it to the Puritans that we are to charge the massacres in Europe, where, within the last year, hospitals have been blown up, filled with the wounded, and thousands of homes and hearts have been desolated. Happy will it be for us, when our own conduct shall be above reproach! And though we may lament the errors of the past, it is not wise to censure too severely the conduct of our ancestors, until we shall have proved ourselves more worthy to sit in judgment upon them. It would not be difficult, for one disposed to be captious, to point out, in the history of Massachusetts, even within ten years, scenes as little creditable as any recorded in this chapter. Passion and prejudice are confined to no age; and each age exhibits excesses and follies of its own.

CHAPTER IX.

RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSIES.

THE religious controversies in which the colony was early involved will form the subject of the present chapter; and an acquaintance with these is highly necessary to a clear understanding of the history of those times. The Puritans came to these shores to establish a community of their own. Dissenting chiefly from the ritual and discipline of the Anglican Church, they designed to erect a church of a different description; and, to protect themselves from aggression from whatever source it might spring, they resolved to exclude from their communion all who did not sympathize with their views, and who would not pledge themselves fully to their support. In this respect they imitated the conduct of the Church from which they had withdrawn; and precisely for the same reasons that dissenters were not tolerated in the bosom of the Episcopal Church, were they shut out from the privileges of the churches of Massachusetts. Puritans as well as Episcopalians assumed their own infallibility; and, as Church and State were one and inseparable in Old England, they were bound together in New England; and the purity of the former was deemed indispensable to the safety of the latter. This policy was resolutely adhered to; and the laws which sanctioned it were as inflexible as the laws of the Medes and Persians. The correctness of such a policy may well be questioned; but it was a policy which our fathers were in a measure compelled to adopt, in order to prevent the overthrow of their community. Nor was it long before they were called upon practically to apply it.

CHAP. IX.

While Europe and America were shrouded in the darkness of religious intolerance, he who was to aid in showing a "more excellent way" had already entered the lists of theological warfare, and was ready to offer himself a sacrifice for the world's benefit. This was Roger Williams, who, from the alembic of his own soul, had evolved the sublime principle of *liberty of conscience*. Within six months after the settlement of Boston, he arrived in the Lyon, accompanied by his wife, the companion of his trials. An exile from England like most of the emigrants, he fled to these shores for freedom and repose. The poverty of his circumstances requiring early employment, he received a call to settle at Salem, as an assistant to Mr. Skelton, in the place of Mr. Higginson, recently deceased. This call was the commencement of a series of difficulties, which led to his banishment from the colony, and his removal to Rhode Island.

Feb. 9, 1630-1.

Apr. 12, 1631.

Looking upon "every national church as of a vicious constitution," the Church of England in particular was, in his estimation, so corrupt as to demand of all a renunciation of its communion; and holding that "the doctrine of persecution for cause of conscience" was a "Bloudy Tenent," "most evidently and lamentably contrary to the doctrine of Christ Jesus," and that "the power of the magistrate extended only to the bodies, and goods, and outward estates of men," he boldly demanded that the ecclesiastical should be wholly divorced from the civil power, and that the church and the magistracy should each be confined to its appropriate sphere.[1] As these opinions, however excellent in themselves, were subversive of the policy of the Puritan as well as of the Episcopal Church, a letter was written to the brethren at Salem, requesting them to forbear to proceed in his settlement; but the very day this letter was written

[1] Cotton's Way, 72; Tenet Washed, 166; Reply, 26, 40, 61, 64, 77.

the church received him as her teacher; and at the ensuing annual court he was admitted freeman.[1] CHAP. IX.

Before summer closed, his connection with this church was dissolved, and he removed to Plymouth. Here, as a Separatist, he was respectfully received, and as a preacher, his services were so acceptable that Governor Bradford says: "I still bless God, and am thankful to him for even his sharpest admonitions, so far as they agreed with truth."[2] For about two years he remained with this people, when the church at Salem, whose affection was undiminished, invited him to return. Elder Brewster, "fearing his continuance might cause divisions," favored his dismission;[3] and, as he was sure of finding sympathy in his former abode, the call was accepted, and some of the Plymouth church accompanied him to his home.[4] May 18, 1631. August, 1633.

Previous to his arrival, the ministers in the Bay had commenced a series of semi-monthly meetings, for debate; and Mr. Skelton, doubtful of the tendency of these meetings, was joined by Mr. Williams in opposing them.[5] The latter had also written a treatise, questioning the right of the colonists to the lands they possessed, on the plea that they held them by a grant from the king rather than by purchase from the natives; and that it was their duty to renounce the patent. For these "errors and presumptions," order was given that "he should be convented to the next court to be censured;" and a letter was written to Mr. Endicott, wishing him to "deal with Mr. Williams to retract the same." This letter was submissively received; the reply of the accused was accompanied with the offer of his "book or any part of it to be burnt;" and at the next court "he appeared penitent, and gave satisfaction of Dec. 27. Jan. 24, 1633-4.

[1] Winthrop, 1. 63.

[2] Bradford, in Prince, 377, ed. 1826.

[3] Cotton's Reply, 4; Morton's Mem.

[4] Morton's Mem., 78; Hubbard, 203-4; Backus, 1. 56; Knowles, 52-3; Elton, 21.

[5] Winthrop, 1. 139; Cotton's Way, 55.

CHAP. IX. his intention and loyalty;" upon which, finding "matters were not so evil as at first they seemed," it was "agreed, that, upon his retractation, or taking an oath of allegiance, it should be passed over."[1]

For the next few months his labors were unmolested;

Aug. 2, 1634. but on the decease of Mr. Skelton, an invitation being extended to him to take his place, the magistrates interposed, and requested the church not to ordain him. To this demand no attention was paid, and he was duly inducted into the duties of his office. This "great contempt of authority" was an unpardonable sin; the church was severely punished; and, as he was supposed to have instigated Mr. Endicott to cut the cross from the colonial flag, and to advocate the wearing of veils by women in church, these heresies, with the renewed charge of "teaching publicly against the king's patent," and terming "the churches of England anti-christian," caused a summons to be issued for his appearance at the next court.[2]

Apr. 29, 1635. By the following spring, other charges were preferred. An oath of fidelity had some time before been drawn up by the magistrates, to be administered to all non-freemen over sixteen years of age, to "discover how the people stood affected to the public safety;" but Mr. Williams, esteeming "an oath for confirmation of office to be peculiar to Christ, and that oaths, being a worship of God, it was not meet for unregenerate persons to take them into their mouths," he protested against their administration by the magistrates as unlawful, being a "prostitution of the Holy name of the Most High to every unclean lip," and "many millions of times taking that name in vain;" and being "heard before

[1] Winthrop, 1. 145–7; Cotton's Tenet Washed, 4, 26; Reply, 27–8, 54; Williams's Reply, 276–7.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 149, 164, 175, 180, 195; Cotton's Reply, 4, 29, 55; Hubbard, 164–5, 204–5; 1 M. H. Coll., 6. 246.—Hubbard, 117 represents Mr. Skelton as holding similar views before his decease.

all the ministers," in their estimation he was "very clearly confuted."[1]

Less than three months after, this charge, and a former one, relating to penal enactments upon religion, or "breaches of the first table" as they were termed, were renewed; to which others were added, as that he held "a man ought not to pray with an unregenerate person, though wife or child," and "ought not to give thanks after the sacrament, nor after meat." Both churches and court convened him to their tribunals, and ministers and magistrates adjudged his opinions "erroneous and dangerous." Yet time was given him till the next court to recant, "or else expect the sentence; it being professedly declared by the ministers, that he who should obstinately maintain such opinions, whereby a church might run into heresy, apostasy, or tyranny, and yet the civil magistrates could not intermeddle, were to be removed, and that the other churches ought to request the magistrates so to do."[2] July 8, 1635.

Unappalled by these proceedings, the youthful recusant "in open court maintained the rocky strength of his grounds," to his own satisfaction, if not to that of others. Yet the severity of his trials, and the constant annoyances to which he was exposed, seriously impaired his health, so that "his life was in danger by his excessive labors, preaching thrice a week, by labors night and day in the field, and by travels night and day, to go and come from the court."[3]

Meanwhile the "elders" continued to deal with him for his errors, and to labor for his conversion; and Mr. Cotton "spent the great part of the summer in seeking by word and writing to satisfy his scruples." Informing the magis-

[1] Winthrop, 1. 188; Cotton's Reply, 4, 16, 29, 55; Knowles, 65.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 193-4; Morton's Mem., 79-82; Mass. Rec's., 1. 160-1; Cotton's Reply, 19, 29, 30; Mather, b. vii. c. ii. s. 6.

[3] Cotton's Reply, 23, 30, 53, 56.

CHAP. IX.

trates of their desire to proceed with him "in a church way" before civil prosecution was urged, the Governor replied, "You are deceived in him if you think he will condescend to learn of any of you." Yet the attempt was made, and several of the churches endeavored to convince him of his errors; but so far were these efforts from changing his views, that he finally refused to appear before them, and wrote his own church that he would no longer commune with the churches in the Bay, nor with them unless they also withdrew: a letter which is said to have "filled all with grief."[1]

Nov. 3, 1635.

Recruiting as fall approached, he was enabled to appear in person at Court; and "all the ministers in the Bay being desired to be present," he was charged with his "seditious" letters, which he justified; and being "offered further conference or disputation, and a month's respite, he chose to dispute presently. So Mr. Hooker was appointed to dispute with him, but could not reduce him from any of his errors. So the next morning the court sentenced him to depart out of our jurisdiction within six weeks, all the ministers, save one, approving the sentence."[2]

Jan'y., 1635-6.

This sentence, however, owing to his infirm health, was not carried into immediate effect, permission being given him to tarry at Salem until spring; but, as he would not remain silent, complaints were heard that he "went about to draw others to his opinions," and "did use to entertain company in his house, and to preach to them, even of such points as he had been censured for." It was also reported that he "had drawn above twenty persons to his opinions, and they were intended to erect a plantation about Narraganset Bay;" and, as it was feared the "infection would

[1] Cotton's Reply, 2, 19, 30, 38, 47.

[2] Cotton's Reply, 9, 27–9, 113; Winthrop, 1. 204; Col. Rec's., vol. 1.—Hubbard, chap. 30, gives a full account of the proceedings against Mr. Williams.

spread from thence into the adjoining churches, the people being much taken with the apprehension of his godliness," it was "agreed to send him to England by a ship then ready to depart," and a warrant was "sent to him to come presently to Boston to be shipped." To this he replied, that "he could not come without hazard of his life: whereupon a pinnace was sent with commission to Capt. Underhill to apprehend him, and carry him aboard the ship, which then lay at Nantasket; but when they came to his house, he had been gone three days before; but whither, they could not learn."[1]

Such is a brief and unvarnished account of the circumstances connected with the banishment of Mr. Williams. And, viewing them with "a calm, a steady, and a Christian hand," as he has solicited, and as justice requires, no one will say it was because of his *immorality* that he was thus "driven from his house, and land, and wife, and children, in the midst of a New England winter," leaving his companion with an infant in her arms, and his eldest daughter but two years old! No one will say it was because he lacked ministerial abilities that he was compelled, with a heavy heart, to part from all dear to him, and plunge into the wilderness, where, "sorely tost for one fourteen weeks, in a bitter winter season, not knowing what bread or bed did mean," he cast himself upon the hospitality of the sons of the forest! In morals he was above reproach; and toward him as a minister there was a "general sentiment of respect." His own statement is, it was "only for the holy truth of Christ Jesus, that he was denied the common air to breathe in, and a civil cohabitation upon the same common earth."[2] And doubtless, it was because his opinions were in advance of those among whom he lived, and con-

[1] Winthrop, 1. 209–10; Cotton's Reply, 57.

[2] Williams's Lett., in 1 M.H. Coll., 1. 276; Cotton's Reply, 3, 7, 8, 13, 41, 44–5, 112.

CHAP. IX. 1635. sidered by them as dangerous and seditious, that he was a sacrifice to honest though mistaken convictions of truth and duty.

There is but one sense in which he was self-banished. "My own voluntary withdrawing," says he, "from all these churches, resolved to continue in those evils, and in persecuting the witnesses of the Lord, presenting light unto them: I confess, it was my own voluntary act; yea, I hope the act of the Lord Jesus sounding forth in me, a poor despised rams-horn, the blast which shall in his own holy season cast down the strength, and confidence of the inventions of men in the worship of God; and lastly his act in enabling me to be faithful in any measure to suffer such great, and mighty trials for his names' sake."[1] Yet if his withdrawal from the *churches* was voluntary, his banishmeet from the *country* was not. That was the act of the magistrates and elders. And, though stigmatized by some as a "haberdasher of small opinions,"[2] and by others as a "weather-cock, constant only in inconstancy,"[3] his "integrity and good intentions" no one can impeach.[4]

Nor was the sentence of banishment passed without reluctance. Governor Winthrop remained his friend to the day of his death, and even proposed, in view of his services in the Pequot War, that his sentence should be revoked.[5] Governor Haynes, of Connecticut, who pronounced his sentence, afterwards regretted it. Governor Winslow, of Plymouth, who had no hand in his expulsion, "put a piece of gold in the hands of his wife," to relieve his necessities.[6] And though Mr. Cotton hardly clears himself from the charge of having procured his sentence,

[1] In Cotton's Reply, 31.
[2] Cotton's Reply.
[3] Wm. Coddington.
[4] Sir W. Martin's Lett., in Hutch. Coll., 106.
[5] Winthrop, vol. 1.; Williams's Lett., in 1 M. H. Coll., 1. 278.
[6] Williams's Lett., in 1 M.H. Coll., 1. 277.

there was no private feud between them.[1] Cotton Mather concedes, that "many judicious persons judged him to have had the root of the matter in him."[2] Later writers declare him, "from the whole course and tenor of his life and conduct, to have been one of the most disinterested men that ever lived, a most pious and heavenly minded soul."[3] And the magnanimous exile himself says: "I did ever from my soul honor and love them, even when their judgment led them to afflict me."[4]

By the private advice of Governor Winthrop, which was received as a "hint from God," the steps of the fugitive were turned to the shores of the Narraganset Bay, and his tent was first pitched, and he began to build and plant at Seekonk; but learning from Mr. Winslow, that that place was within the Plymouth patent, and that they were "loth to displease the Bay," he, with five others, moved "to the other side of the water," and settled at Providence.[5] His intercourse with the Indians here proved of service to him. He had secured the confidence of Massasoit, the amiable chieftain of the Wampanoags; and the "barbarous heart of Canonicus," the chief sachem of the Narragansets, "loved him as his son to the last gasp." By these "ravens" was the wanderer, Elijah-like, "fed in the wilderness;" and, as a requital for their kindness, he was ever, through life, their advocate and friend. As a token of esteem, Canonicus and Miantonomo conveyed to him the land upon which he founded his colony. "Not thousands nor tens of thousands of money" could have bought

Jan'y., 1635-6.

[1] Cotton's Reply, 8, 25, 35–40; Way, 55.

[2] Magnalia, 2. 433.

[3] Callender, in 4 R. I. Coll., 72; Hutchinson, 1. 42.

[4] Savage, on Winthrop, vol. 1.

[5] Williams's Lett., in 1 M.H. Coll., 1. 276; Bliss's Rehoboth.—An approximation to the date of his removal to Providence, may be gathered from his statement that, between his friends of the Bay and Plymouth, he was "sorely tost for one fourteen weeks;" and, as he left Salem in Jan'y., 1635–6, he may have settled at Providence about the last of April, though some think not until June.

CHAP. IX. 1636.

it. It was the gift of the chiefs for favors received. And though the title of the grantee was disputed by the neighboring colonies, who were unwilling to permit him, even in exile, to live in peace, the land was "as truly his own as any man's coat upon his back." Yet he reserved it not for himself, but "desired it for a shelter for persons distressed for conscience," and "gave away his lands and other estate, to them he thought were most in want, until he gave away all."[1]

His subsequent career belongs to the history of Rhode Island; and in taking leave of him here, we need only say, that, however unjustifiable upon the broad grounds of Christian toleration was the conduct of our fathers in their treatment of this excellent man, the purity of his life, the fervency of his zeal, and the sincerity of his religious convictions, joined to the triumph of the principles he espoused, especially his doctrine of the sanctity of conscience, have gained for him an immortality of fame as merited and as precious as the fame of his judges; and, as the fables and visions of one age, become the facts and the practice of that which succeeds, so the prosperity of that colony for which he labored so earnestly, and its successful vindication of his once despised but now accepted doctrine of soul-liberty, which the world is beginning to recognize as an immutable truth, render its history one of interest and attraction in the annals of New England.[2]

1636. The second controversy in which the colony was involved, followed soon after the removal of Mr. Williams, and originated from opinions advanced by Mrs. Anne Hutchinson, a

[1] Backus, 1. 290; D. Williams's Lett., in Knowles, 111.

[2] For an eloquent tribute to the memory of this noble minded man, see Bancroft's U. S., 1. 367–82.—Backus, Benedict, Knowles, Gammel, Elton, Staples, and others, have sketched his life, and all have endeavored to do him justice. It would be strange if he never erred, for to err is human: but his is probably as bright a character as any in the early history of New England.

member of the Boston Church, and a "woman of a ready wit and a bold spirit,"[1] who came to America in the Griffin, in 1634, with her husband, William Hutchinson, of Alford, in Lincolnshire, a "gentleman of good estate and good reputation."[2] CHAP. IX. 1636.

For some time before her arrival, in addition to the usual Thursday Lecture, which has been held with but casual interruptions from that day to this,[3] private meetings of the members of each congregation were held, to reconsider the sermons of the preceding Sunday, and discuss the doctrines advanced from the pulpit. As women were debarred from joining in these debates, and if present were only silent auditors, Mrs. Hutchinson, who possessed striking controversial talents, and who was familiar with the most abstruse speculations of the theology of the day, conceiving that the passage which enjoins "the elder women to teach the younger" was a sufficient warrant for her course, established separate female assemblies, of which she was the leader, and in which her didactic powers, and her gifts in devotional performances, were conspicuously exercised. The wives of the colonists, who had partaken the perils and struggles of their husbands, had imbibed no small share of their masculine energy; and, as many of them had enjoyed the advantages of an excellent education, and had been accustomed to a life replete with intellectual excitement, they experienced a craving for something to animate and engage their faculties; and to satisfy this craving, and thinking their spiritual edification was as important as that of their "lords," these assemblies were instituted, which were at first regarded with much approbation, and "the great respect she had in the hearts of all,

Titus, 2: 4.

[1] Winthrop, 1. 239; Johnson, in 2 M. H. Coll., 4. 15; Hubbard, 283.

[2] Cotton's Way, 51; Hutchinson, vol. 2, App.; Savage, on Winthrop, 1. 171; Ellis's Life of Mrs. H.; Upham's Life of Vane; Drake's Boston, 227, &c.

[3] Emerson's Hist. First Church.

CHAP. IX. 1636.

and her profitable and sober carriage of matters, made this her practice less suspected by the godly magistrates and elders."[1] Hence her meetings became popular; Mrs. Hutchinson, from the zeal and ability with which she conducted them, acquired, by an anagrammatical transposition of the letters of her name, the title of "the Nonsuch;"[2] and her assemblies were termed "gossippings," a term then of respectable import, though subsequently converted into one of ridicule and contempt. From sixty to eighty of the principal females of Boston attended her gatherings; and in them she was accustomed, in a "prophetical way," to resolve questions of doctrine, and expound passages of Scripture, with as oracular authority as the wisest of the clergy.[3]

Nor did she lack adherents of the other sex to aid in the propagation of her sentiments. Mr. Wheelwright, her brother-in-law, a clergyman of estimable character and respectable talents, sympathized with her opinions and publicly advocated them.[4] Mr. Cotton, whose previous acquaintance prepossessed him in her favor, was dazzled by her genius, and attracted by her zeal; by an adroit stroke of policy, touching the weak point in his character — for we are all susceptible to flattery — she succeeded in attaching him more firmly to her cause; and, as the minister of all others most highly esteemed, his espousal of her doctrines augmented her influence in the eyes of the people, and caused her to be regarded with greater admiration. Mr. Vane, the Governor of the colony, fresh from the theological schools of Geneva, and by character and temperament deeply interested in religion, believing her to be a woman of unquestionable piety, approved her sentiments and became her supporter.[5]

[1] Pref. Short Story; Cotton's Way, 50–1.
[2] Grahame, 1. 177.
[3] Winthrop, 1. 286; Cotton's Way, 51, 87.
[4] Winthrop, 1. 239; Cotton's Way, 40.
[5] Winthrop, 1. 241, 246; Hubbard, 289.

As her meetings progressed, her views attracted the attention of the ministers in the Bay, who began to inquire into them;[1] and being freely discussed in all parts of the colony, their verisimilitude made them popular, so that they were "diffused into the very veins and vitals of the people in the country," and "had some of all sorts and quality, in all places, to defend and patronize them; some of the magistrates, some gentlemen, some scholars and men of learning, some burgesses of the General Court, some captains and soldiers, some chief men in towns, and some men eminent for religion, parts and wit."[2]

So deeply was the Boston church tinctured with her views, that all but four or five finally embraced them,[3] and a proposition was early made, that Mr. Wheelwright should be "called to be a teacher there;" but Mr. Winthrop, esteeming him "one apt to raise doubtful disputations," opposed the proposition as endangering the peace of the church, which was already "well furnished with able ministers, whose spirits they knew, and whose labors God had blessed;" and so successfully did he argue his case, that the proposition was rejected, and Mr. Wheelwright was "called to a new church to be gathered at Mount Wollaston," now Braintree.[4] Oct. 30. 1636.

Emboldened by success,[5] Mrs. Hutchinson was so far seduced by the popularity she enjoyed, as to transgress the bounds of decorum and propriety; and, constituting herself a dictator of orthodoxy, and a censor of the spiritual condition of all the ministers and inhabitants of the colony, a scrutiny was instituted into the character and conduct of both clergy and laity; her canons of doctrine were received as unerring truth; her revelations of future

[1] Winthrop, 1. 240.
[2] Pref. Short Story; Cotton's Way 51–2.
[3] Winthrop, 1. 252; Cotton's Way, 58, 87; Hubbard, 293.
[4] Winthrop, 1. 241; Cotton's Way, 60; Hubbard, 286–7.
[5] Cotton's Way, 52.

CHAP. IX. 1636.

events were regarded as infallible; and a defamatory persecution was waged against all who opposed them. Forgetting the advice of the poet,

> "Pray thee, take pain
> To allay with some cold drops of modesty
> Thy skipping spirit,"

in her assemblies, unbridled license was given to that unruly member, the tongue; and the minds of the people being highly excited, a feeble spark sufficed to kindle a formidable conflagration, and the flames of theological warfare burst out in many of the churches with such fury, that they threatened to consume all charity and forbearance.[1]

The opinions of Mrs. Hutchinson, which produced this heat, divested of the technicalities which have involved them in so much mystery, seem to have been as follows: As great stress was laid by the clergy upon the external evidences of sanctification or piety, gravity of deportment, precision of manners, formality of speech, peculiarity of dress, and other illusive signs of holiness, were held in such high estimation, that all destitute of these signs, however irreproachable in life or amiable in conduct, were considered unworthy to be called "the children of God." Mrs. Hutchinson, in opposition to these notions, maintained that outward signs of discipleship might be displayed by a hypocrite, and hence that "sanctification," which embraced these signs, was not infallible evidence of "justification," or true Christian discipleship. The clergy also, who were believers in the personality of the Holy Ghost, denied for the most part His union with the regenerate in any sense; but Mrs. Hutchinson, understanding this phrase to include an embodiment of spiritual graces or gifts, maintained that, in the true Christian, these graces and the Spirit had their

[1] Pref. Short Story.

abode; or, in the language of her accusers, that there was an "indwelling of the person of the Holy Ghost" in the heart of the true believer, "so as to amount to a personal union:"—a doctrine which, in their estimation, made "the believer more than a creature," and which some censured as rank "Montanism."[1]

But the spirit of contention when thoroughly aroused is not easily allayed; and the "exquisite rancor of theological hatred" was destined to be more fully developed. The ministers, perhaps with cause, suspected that Mrs. Hutchinson's depreciations of external sanctity were instigated, to some extent, by a satirical design, and that she purposed to reflect upon their own austerity;[2] and when once it became a prevalent opinion that such was her design, the gall of bitterness entered their hearts; new pungency was given to the sallies of her wit; and her discourses were the more keenly relished by the discerning, who saw at whom her piercing shafts were adroitly leveled.

"Now," say her accusers in doleful terms, "Now the faithful ministers of Christ must have dung cast on their faces, and be no better than legal preachers, Baal's priests, Popish factors, Scribes, Pharisees, and opposers of Christ himself. Now they must be pointed at, as it were with the finger, and reproached by name. Such a church officer is an ignorant man, and knows not Christ; such an one is under a covenant of works; such a pastor is a proud man, and would make a good persecutor. Now, after our sermons were ended at our public lectures, you might have seen half a dozen pistols discharged at the face of the preacher, (I mean) so many objections made by the opinionists in the open assembly against the doctrines deliv-

[1] Winthrop, vol. 1.; Hubbard, 286; R. Clap, in Chron. Mass., 360; Shepard, in ibid., 346; Short Story; Upham's Life of Vane; Foster's Statesmen, &c.

[2] Pref. Short Story.

CHAP. IX. 1636.

ered, if it suited not their new fancies, to the marvellous weakening of holy truths delivered."[1]

These personal reflections were certainly uncourteous; and the course of Mrs. Hutchinson, in descending to such invectives, merits censure. Had the magistrates and ministers oppugned her on this ground alone, the discreet and the prudent would doubtless have sanctioned their verdict; but, falling into an error as great as her own, they determined to silence her by prosecuting her as a heretic. The number of her friends, however, made this a matter requiring delicate management; for Governor Vane, Mr. Cotton, and Mr. Wheelwright, were not to be despised as adversaries. Their first step, therefore, was to endeavor to counteract the influence of Governor Vane; and at a convention of elders and magistrates, called to "advise about pacifying these differences," Mr. Dudley desired all to be "free and open," and an animated and somewhat exciting discussion ensued. Mr. Peter, as the organ of the clergy, expressed their regret that Mr. Vane should be jealous of their meetings, and seek to restrain their liberty; and plainly told him that, "before he came, the churches were in peace." With equal spirit the Governor rejoined: "The light of the gospel brings a sword, and the children of the bond-woman will persecute those of the free-woman." Mr. Wilson, the pastor of the Boston church, joined in the discussion, and made a "sad speech," bewailing the condi tion of the churches, and the danger of separation if these things continued. Mr. Cotton tartly replied, and "admonished" the pastor. The "common people" approved his censures. But Mr. Winthrop took up in Mr. Wilson's defense, justified his language, and reproved Mr. Cotton.[2]

The official opposers of Mrs. Hutchinson proved stronger than her friends. All the magistrates but three, and all

[1] Short Story. See also 2 M. H. Coll., 4. 10.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 248–52, 255; Cotton's Way, 58; Hubbard, 290–2.

the ministers but two, agreed with Mr. Wilson. Their next step, therefore, was to deal with Mr. Cotton; and a document, containing "sixteen points" conceived to be erroneous, was drawn up, to which "unequivocal answers" were entreated. To this he replied, and "some doubts he well cleared, but in some things he gave no satisfaction." To the latter his brethren responded; and at the next General Court, it was "agreed to put off all lectures for three weeks, that they might bring things to some issue."[1] But the difficulties continued to increase, so that "all men's mouths were full of them." Mr. Cotton remained intractable, and his brethren still opposed him. A ship was a Boston, ready to sail for England; and Mr. Cotton, with great naivetè, requested the passengers to state to their friends, that all the strife in the churches "was about magnifying the grace of God; one party seeking to advance the grace of God *within* us, and the other to advance the grace of God *towards* us;" so that no friend of grace need be deterred from embarking for America. This message, at first glance, savors of nothing but the honey of the bee; but there were not wanting those who felt a sting in the words; and Mr. Wilson brusquely rejoined, that "he knew of none, elders or brethren, who did not labor to advance the free grace of God in justification, so far as the word of God required."[2] CHAP. IX.

At the next General Court, Mr. Wilson's course was approved, and Mr. Wheelwright was subjected to public censure. The latter had delivered a discourse shortly before, which "seemed to tend to sedition," and its erroneous sentiments he was called upon to retract.[3] The adherents of Mrs. Hutchinson were popularly termed advocates of a "covenant of faith," and her opponents had been branded Mar. 9, 1636-7. Jan. 19.

[1] Winthrop, 1. 249, 253, 254.
[2] Hubbard, 294; Emerson, Hist. First Church.
[3] Mass. Rec's., 1. 189; Winthrop, vol. 1.; Hubbard, 282, 295.

CHAP. IX.

as teaching a "covenant of works;" and these cabalistic catchwords, the Shibboleths of party theological strife, were generally adopted. Mr. Wheelwright was accused of "inveighing against all that walked in a covenant of works," and as "stirring up the people with much bitterness and vehemency." His sermon was produced in support of this charge, and he justified it; and though it still exists in manuscript,[1] and few at the present day would probably regard it as a particularly exceptionable production, he was adjudged "guilty of sedition and contempt." Governor Vane and others dissented from this verdict; but their protest was rejected. The Boston church also tendered a petition in his behalf; and the court, finding the matter a serious one, deemed it prudent to "defer sentence till the next court;" and he was commended to the care of the Boston church, and enjoined to appear at the time appointed.[2]

Thus proceedings were instituted against the three principal friends of Mrs. Hutchinson. Upon a few also of inferior rank the hands of magisterial displeasure were laid; and "one Stephen Greensmith, for affirming that all the ministers, except Mr. Cotton, Mr. Wheelwright, and he thought Mr. Hooker, did teach a covenant of works," was censured to acknowledge his fault in every church, and fined £40, with sureties for £100.[3]

May 17, 1637.

The transactions of the annual Court were alluded to in a former chapter;[4] and we need only say that the people of Boston, indignant at the rejection of men whom they respected, that very night held a public meeting, and chose Mr. Vane, Mr. Coddington, and Mr. Hough, as their deputies; but the Court, on the pretext that two freemen had

[1] At the rooms of the Mass. Hist. Soc. Extracts from it are given in the "Glass for the people of N. E.," ed. 1676, pp. 5, 19, 20.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 256–8; Glass for the people of N. E., 6, where the discussion is recited.

[3] Winthrop, 1. 256, 280; Mass. Rec's., 1. 189, 196, 200.

[4] Chap. 8, p. 205.

no notice of the election, refused to receive them. The next morning they were again returned; and the "court, not finding how they might reject them, they were admitted."[1] The party triumphant, who had secured the colonial government, now began in good earnest to suppress by main force the Hutchinsonian heresy; and first of all, an order was passed prohibiting the admission of strangers into the colony without leave. The next step was to reduce Mr. Cotton, and expel Mr. Wheelwright. The latter appeared at court as he had been enjoined; but, as a committee of the church had been chosen to "confer about all difficulties," a respite was given him, in hopes of his repentance, to the first Tuesday in August, which was subsequently renewed "until he should be sent for."[2] Prudential motives may have influenced this decision.[3] Mr. Vane was yet in the colony; his friends were numerous; and, though turned out of the government, he was still powerful, and quick to detect and expose everything savoring of persecution:—but in August he left the country to return to England.[4] 1637.

Immediately upon his departure, a council of ministers is recorded, which had been contemplated for some time, and which "met divers days and agreed, with consent of the magistrates, upon a day of humiliation to be kept in all the churches, on the 24th, and for a conference, or Synod, to commence on the 30th." At the time fixed, this Synod met at Newtown, being composed of "all the teaching elders throughout the country, and some new come out of England."[5] It was the first body of the kind convened in Massachusetts; a grand Court of Spiritual Inquest; Aug. 5. Aug. 30.

[1] Winthrop, 1. 261–3; Mass. Rec's., 1. 195.
[2] Winthrop, 1. 263–5; Mass. Rec's., 1. 196, 200, 205.
[3] Pref. Short Story; Savage on Winthrop.
[4] Winthrop, 1. 277, 281; Hubbard, 262.
[5] Johnson, in 2. M. H. Coll., 4. 34; 7. 1; Hubbard, 295–6; Hutchinson, 1. 68.

CHAP. IX. 1637.

an Inquisitorial Tribunal; an Ephesian, or Nicene Council; whose purpose was, to condemn heresy, confine orthodoxy within the limits of a definite creed, and settle the faith of future generations.

A quaint author observes that, at its opening, "much time was spent in ventilation, and emptying of private passions," before proceeding to the main business; and when this was reached, a formidable catalogue of eighty-two "blasphemous, erroneous, and unsafe" opinions was read; the "unwholesome expressions," nine in number, were next taken up; and then "the Scriptures were (dis) abused."[1] Some of Boston and elsewhere were offended at this voluminous array of heresies, and demanded the names of the persons who held these errors; but on this point the Synod was dumb. No parties were named, on the plea that "this assembly has not to do with persons, but doctrines only." The magistrates were present in the Council, and, as usual, took part in the debate,—Governor Winthrop exercising a controlling sway; and, when the demand for names was renewed, they interfered, and declared that they should regard further pertinacity as a "civil disturbance," and deal with the offenders accordingly. The dissentients objected to this, "as if the magistrates had nothing to do in the assembly;" upon which Governor Winthrop replied that, "if they wished to make trial of it, they might see his threat executed." This silenced most of them; but "some of Boston departed from the assembly and came no more."[2]

The ceremony of condemning the eighty-two errors being disposed of, there yet remained "five points" in question, between Mr. Cotton and Mr. Wheelwright on the one hand, and the rest of the elders on the other, which were amply

[1] Winthrop, 1. 284; Short Story, Pref., and pp. 1–23; Cotton's Way, 41, 47, 60; Johnson, in 2 M. H. Coll., 4. 14, 34.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 243–5; Cotton's Way, 48, 63.

discussed, so that, nominally, "they soon came to understand each other better," though in reality, the "peace of the churches was restored by darkness;"[1] for perhaps some of the malecontents, as Hubbard suggests,[2] were "not much unlike the gentleman that, to make it appear how resolute a Catholic he was, was heard to say, he not only believed Christ was really present in the sacrament, but that he was there *booted and spurred*, as he rode to Jerusalem." CHAP. IX. 1637.

Resolutions condemning the public meetings of Mrs. Hutchinson were next passed; and others restricting the liberty of questioning the ministers openly for their sermons; after which, having been in session three weeks, "the assembly broke up," much to the satisfaction of Governor Winthrop, who was so pleased with its "comfortable and cheerful" termination, that he proposed holding a similar meeting "the next year, to nourish love, and settle what remained to be agreed;" but his motion, though "liked of all," seems not to have prevailed! The ministers may have doubted the expediency of such conventions for "nourishing love!"[3]

The result of this conclave could not be judged by the apparent harmony which prevailed at its gatherings. Mr. Hooker had expressed his doubts of the policy of a Synod, as its chief agents would be chief parties in the cause; and "for them only who are prejudiced in the controversy to pass sentence, against cause or person, how improper! how unprofitable!"[4] The justice of these views was soon evident. In all ages of the Christian church, controversies have arisen; nor are such to be deprecated when conducted in the spirit of candor and kindness. Discussion elicits truth. Mind slowly progresses in the acquisition of light.

[1] Cotton's Way, 41–7.
[2] Hist. N. E., 303.
[3] Winthrop, 1. 285–8. Hubbard, chap. 40, gives a full account of this Synod.
[4] Hutchinson, 1. 68.

CHAP. IX. 1637.

And it is only by the active exercise of its powers that it is preserved from stagnation, or from being encrusted with conservatism. We may lament the rancor which has too often disgraced such discussions; the headstrong zeal, which has prompted to malevolence, rending anew the seamless coat of the Saviour; and the contest for victory rather than for truth. So was it with the Synod which condemned Antinomianism. Mr. Wheelwright and his friends were supposed to have been "clearly confuted and confounded;" yet, according to their accusers, "they persisted in their opinions, and were as busy in nourishing contentions as before." Mr. Cotton alone stood aloof from his old allies. The remonstrances of his brethren, and his perceptible decline in popular favor, operated, perhaps, far more effectually than all argumentation to disengage him from the interest of Mrs. Hutchinson. From the day of the Synod, therefore, he was no longer formidable. Past the "centre of indifference," he was now in a transition state, inclining to retrace his steps, and to come back to the bosom of the church, never more to depart.[1]

Hence Mr. Wheelwright stood comparatively alone; and, as the last male head of the Hydra monster which had so long disturbed the visions and harrowed the souls of the rest of his brethren, it was resolved to strike the final and effectual blow of decapitation. Accordingly, at the next court, "finding upon consultation that two so opposite parties could not continue in the same body without apparent hazard of ruin to the whole," it was "agreed to send away some of the principal;" and for this a "fair opportunity," or more properly *pretext*, "was offered by the remonstrance or petition," which had been preferred by the friends of Mr. Wheelright, in which they affirmed him to be "inno-

[1] Hubbard, 302; Cotton's Way, 47, 64; Baillie's Dissuasive, 58.

cent, and that the Court had condemned the truth of Christ." His sentence was disfranchisement, and banishment within fourteen days. From this he appealed to the king; but was told an appeal did not lie, for by the king's grant they had power to determine without any reservation.[1] Winter had set in when he took his departure from this scene of strife, and, with a few faithful companions, who adhered to him through all vicissitudes, he journeyed to New Hampshire, and laid the foundations of Exeter.[2] Capt. Underhill, a "soldier of fortune, seeking provant and plunder," whose exploits in the Pequot War are blazoned by his own pen;[3] a man in whom religious fervor was not so blended with Christian purity as to preserve him from suspicions of lechery and incontinency;[4] who professed to have received the spirit of grace while "smoking his pipe"[5] — though from the accompanying "smoke" it has been suggested that the spirit "came from the bottomless pit;"[6] — one of those hangers-on, who will attach themselves to any sect for the sake of notoriety, and whose excesses are not chargeable to those who have the misfortune to be afflicted with such adherents; being sentenced to banishment as a signer of the seditious petition, purposed to have joined Mr. Wheelwright, and was, for a time, a turbulent and refractory citizen of Dover; but, becoming dissatisfied with his location, and "making his peace with his brethren at Boston," he removed to the Dutch settlement at Long Island, — his wife being a Dutch woman, — and age having cooled the impetuosity of his

[1] Mass. Rec's., 1. 205, 207; Winthrop, 1. 293-4; Short Story, 28-9; Coddington's Demonstration, 12.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 338; Hutchinson, 1. 74; Hubbard, 242; Belknap's N. H., 1. 37. In 1644, "upon the acknowledgement of his evil carriages," his sentence was commuted, and he was "received again as a member of this colony." Mass. Rec's., 3. 6.

[3] In 3 M. H. Coll., 6.

[4] Winthrop, 1. 324-6; 2. 16-17, 49, 76.

[5] Winthrop, vol. 2.

[6] Hubbard.

CHAP. IX.

passions, he there sobered down into a respectable "Burgermaster," and died in peace.[1]

Mr. Wheelwright being banished, the last obstacle to the expulsion of Mrs. Hutchinson was removed; and at the same court, she was charged with her errors; but, neither softened by persuasion, nor moved by terror, she argued for two days ably and spiritedly in her own defense. Claiming to be supernaturally inspired, she "vented her revelations," rebuking her judges for their wicked persecution of the truth, comparing herself to the prophet Daniel in the den of lions, and declaring it had been "revealed to her, that she should come into New England, and should be persecuted, and that God would ruin the colonists, their posterity, and the whole estate for the same."[2] In vain did Bradstreet intercede in her behalf. Neither her sex nor her claims impressed or softened the hearts of her judges; and the prevailing party, exulting in its power, determined to cut up by the roots this "pestilent source of contention;" and "Mrs. Hutchinson, the wife of Mr. William Hutchinson, being convented for traducing the ministers, and their ministry in the country .... was thereupon banished, and in the meanwhile was committed to Mr. Joseph Welde (of Roxbury) until the Court shall dispose of her."[3]

Nov. 2, 1637.

Finally, as spring dawned, the last act of the drama closed; and, while the rude winds of March were blustering around, she was convented upon Lecture-day, and examined anew. She had been previously catechized by the church, and, persisting in upholding her "errors," Mr. Cotton, "fully satisfied that he had been made her stalking horse," and who was zealously engaged, publicly and pri-

Mar. 2, 1637-8.

[1] Mass. Rec's., 1. 208; Winthrop, passim; Dunlap's N. Y., 1. 73–83; Brodhead's N. Y.; Wood's Long Island, 1. 65, &c., &c.

[2] See Hutchinson, vol. 2, App., for her defense; and comp. Hubbard, 284.

[3] Mass. Rec's., 1. 207, 225, 226; Winthrop, 1. 304, 306.

vately, in confuting her "heresies," was called upon to pass the verdict of the church, and "pronounced the sentence of admonition with great solemnity, and with much zeal and detestation of her errors and pride of spirit." This was the unkindest cut of all! This blow staggered her! And the unhappy woman, baited and worried by her clerical tormentors, "pumped and sifted to get something against her," stigmatized as "the American Jezebel," cast out of the church, spit upon, and defied as it were, scarce knew what she said; and, failing to give satisfaction to those whom nothing probably would now have made lenient, was excommunicated in due form; and her husband having gone with others to Narraganset, thither she followed him, and upon the island of Aquidneck found a temporary but stormy home.[1]

The next step of the magistrates marks the intolerance of the age. All, who had adhered to Mr. Wheelwright or Mrs. Hutchinson, or signed petitions or remonstrances in their favor, and who refused to acknowledge their fault, were disarmed; the powder and arms of the country were removed to Roxbury for safety; divers military officers were censured for being "favorers of familistical persons and opinions;" a law was passed to punish by fine, imprisonment, disfranchisement or banishment, any who should "defame any court, or any of its sentences;" and the proceedings of the General Court upon this whole affair, with the reasons, were sent to England to be published, "to the end that our godly friends might not be discouraged from coming to us."[2]

[1] Cotton's Way, 84–6; Winthrop, 1. 307–8, 309–11, 318, 322; 2. 18, 46–8; Johnson, in 2 M. H. Coll., 7. 14; Glass for the people of N. E., 10.

[2] Mass. Rec's., 1. 208, 209, 211, 213; Winthrop, 1. 296–8; Johnson, in 2 M. H. Coll., 7. 6; Hutchinson, 1. 74. The work here referred to is that usually quoted as Welde's Short Story, though it would appear from the statements of Cotton, Way, 56–8, and Baillie, Dissuasive, 57, 64, that only the Preface was written by Mr. Welde, and that the body of the work was from another hand.

CHAP. IX.

Such was the end of the second controversy. Throughout, it was attended with the usual evils resulting from strong religious excitement. Some, during its progress, were "driven to utter desperation;" and one poor mother, who "could not endure to hear of any comfort," took her infant and threw it into a well, exclaiming: "Now I am sure I shall be damned, for I have drowned my child!"[1] Even after the departure of Mrs. Hutchinson, the rancor of the age, blinded with the spirit of malignant intolerance, invented and circulated stories of the most loathsome and extravagant character.[2] And an earthquake, which occurred that year, was regarded as symbolical of the Antinomian shaking which the churches had received.[3]

Dec. 13, 1638.

Very soon, however, complaints were heard of the "decay of religion, and the general decline of professors to the world."[4] The customary reaction was taking place. Passions, intensely excited, must subside; and experience proves that, in nearly all cases, where great religious commotions have prevailed, characterized by more zeal than knowledge, there has been afterwards a dropping off of some of the more zealous, and they often become worse than they were before.

The sequel to Mrs. Hutchinson's history is melancholy and tragical. Remaining at Aquidneck until the decease

1642.

of her husband, she removed thence to the "Dutch country" beyond New Haven; and the next year, with all her family save one daughter, was killed by the Indians. Her friends charged the guilt of her murder upon those who expelled her from Massachusetts; her enemies pronounced it a judgment of God.[5] No one, it is presumed, will exon-

[1] Winthrop, 1. 281–2.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 313–17, 326–8; Pref. Short Story; Johnson, in 2 M. H. Coll., 4. 15; Cotton's Way, 91; Glass for the people of N. E., 11–12.

[3] Winthrop, 1. 319.

[4] Winthrop, vol. 2; Hubbard, 297; Hutchinson, 1. 74.

[5] Short Story, Winthrop, Hubbard, Mather, Trumbull, &c. Comp. also Bolton's West Chester, Brodhead's N. Y., Ellis's Life of Mrs. H., Upham's Life of Vane, and the Glass for the people of N. E., p. 8.

erate either party from blame in this affair. Encompassed with the privations of a wilderness life, and invested with the cares of a young and numerous family, the gentleness of her sex should have moderated the enthusiasm of Mrs. Hutchinson's zeal, and have restrained it within those bounds which can never be exceeded without detriment to the character of woman, however extraordinary her genius or brilliant her accomplishments. On the part of her judges, too, there was inexcusable severity, and unnecessary virulence; and, had they profited by their own experience in the land of their nativity, they would have tempered their conduct with more charity and forbearance. The same spirit, doubtless, which, in 1646, adjudged Mrs. Oliver "to be *whipped* for reproaching the magistrates," and which actually inflicted the disgraceful punishment, and even added the indignity of placing "a cleft stick upon her tongue for reproaching the elders," might have hurried our fathers into similar excesses in their dealings with Mrs. Hutchinson, *had it not been for the number and respectability of her friends.*[1]

Before the close of the controversy with Mrs. Hutchinson, he whose destiny it was to stir afresh the bitter waters of theological strife, was already in the country; and three colonies at least were involved in disputes with him. This was Samuel Gorton, a citizen of London, who arrived at Boston in 1636, but who soon left that place and settled at Plymouth.[2] By nearly all early writers he is branded as a "prodigious minter of exorbitant novelties," a "proud and pestilent seducer," "laden with blasphemies and familistical opinions."[3] But later writers are more moderate in their censures; and one in particular, well qualified to judge in

1636.

[1] Winthrop, 1. 338–40; Morton's Mem., 106–8.

[2] Simplicity's Defence, 18, 19, in Force, vol. 4, Tract 6; Hubbard, 402; Cotton's Tenet Washed, 5; Hutchinson, 1. 112; N. E. Gen. Reg., 4. 201, &c.

[3] Cotton, Morton, Johnson, Hubbard, Josselyn, Mather, &c.

CHAP. IX. such matters, speaking of his civil career in Rhode Island, where most of his time was spent, says: "He was almost constantly in office; and during a long life there is no instance of record, to my knowledge, of any reproach or censure cast upon him."[1]

That he professed little reverence for constituted authorities, civil or religious, is unquestionable; and his conduct towards such was never over respectful, nor is it matter of surprise that it was regarded, in many instances, as contemptuous and provoking. That he was sincere in his religious opinions, we see no reason to doubt; but, unfortunately for him, those opinions were at variance with the creed of his day; and unfortunately for us, they are couched in such ambiguous language that few can comprehend them. His idiosyncrasies were mysticism and enthusiasm; and, conceiving himself inferior to no one in abilities or consequence, he was usually in the attitude of opposition and defiance. Yet we are unwilling to admit that he possessed naturally a malevolent spirit, or that his character was radically and wholly corrupt. In either respect, it is quite probable, he was as good as the average of his accusers. His greatest fault was rashness; that lack of forbearance, affability and courtesy, without which the path of life is rugged and thorny. He was a leveler of the sternest kind, and withal an enthusiast, not without conceit. In his writings there are strong and even eloquent passages; and he pleads his own cause with that air of sincerity, which makes it the more necessary to subject to an impartial scrutiny the conflicting details of his extraordinary career.

June, 1638. Soon after his settlement at Plymouth, we find him in collision with both ministers and magistrates; and for his

[1] Hon. S. Eddy, in Savage's Winthrop, 2. 70–1. See also Eliot, in 1 M. H. Coll., 9. 35–6; Callender, in 4 R. I. Coll.; Mackie's Life of Gorton; Staple's Annals of Prov.; C. Deane, Esq., in N. E. Gen. Reg., 4. 211, &c., &c. Hubbard, chap. 47, gives an account of the controversy with Gorton.

"turbulent carriage" he was amerced in a heavy fine, and required to find sureties during his stay, which was limited to fourteen days.[1] In "the extremity of winter" he left for Rhode Island. Here, being convicted of similar insubordination, he was first imprisoned, and afterwards whipped.[2] Moving to Providence, Roger Williams, true to his principles, afforded him a shelter, although he had no sympathy with his particular views. But here, too, as elsewhere, he was soon involved in disputes, growing out of lands he had purchased; and in the heat of passion blows were given, and "some few drops of blood were shed on either side."[3] The old residents, fearful that Gorton would expel them from their possessions, applied to Massachusetts for aid; but were required first to "submit themselves to some jurisdiction," and after nearly a year's delay, four persons went to Boston and "yielded themselves and their lands to be protected by Massachusetts."[4]

1639-40

Nov. 17, 1641.

Sept., 1642.

Immediately the colonial authorities, assuming jurisdiction over all the inhabitants of Providence,—a claim which was eagerly set up, and long persisted in,—issued a warrant informing them of this submission, and adding: "We are to maintain them in their lawful right. If therefore you have any just title to anything they possess, you may proceed against them in our court, where you shall have equal justice: but if you shall proceed to any violence, you must not blame us, if we take a like course to right

Oct. 28, 1642.

[1] Morton, Mem., says he was convented in Dec. 1638; but Callender and Staples say he was at Aquidneck in June.—See further on the causes of his removal, Winslow's Hypoc. Unmasked; Gorton's Lett. to Morton, 6, 7, in Force, vol. 4; and Deane, in N. E. Gen., 4. 212–13.

[2] Winslow's Hypoc. Unmasked, 51–4; Lechford, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 96–7; Josselyn, in ibid., 382; Morton's Mem., 108; Gorton's Lett., 8; N. E. Gen. Reg., 4. 214.

[3] Winslow; Winthrop, 2. 71; Providence Letter, in 3 M. H. Coll., 1. 2–4; Williams's Lett., and Arnold and Winthrop's Statement, in N. E. Gen. Reg., 4. 216–19; Williams's Reply to Cotton, 113; Morton's Mem.

[4] Winthrop, 2. 69–71, 102; Col. Rec's., vol. 2.; 3 M. H. Coll., 1. 2–4; Staples, Ann. Prov., 45–6.

CHAP. IX.

them."[1] To this warrant a characteristic reply was sent;[2] and, purchasing of Miantonomo, a parcel of land at Shaw-

Jan. 12, 1642-3. omet, now Warwick, thither, with his eleven associates, Gorton soon after removed. But here he was again involved in difficulty; for "Pomham and Soconoco," two petty sachems, laid claim to the land he had purchased,

June, 1643. and came under the jurisdiction of Massachusetts for defense.[3]

Sep. 12. Upon this, a warrant was issued to the inhabitants of Shaw-omet requiring their appearance at Boston;[4] and

Sep. 15. three days after, a Reply from Randall Holden was sent to "The Great and Honoured Idol General now set up in the Massachusetts," in which he says: "We are resolved that according as you put forth yourselves toward us, so shall you find us transformed to answer you. If you put forth your hand to us as countrymen, ours are in readiness for you; — if your sword be drawn, ours is girt upon our thigh; — if you present a gun, make haste to give the first fire, for we are come to put fire upon the earth, and it is our desire to have it speedily kindled."[5] Gorton's reply was verbal, refusing to appear;[6] and the government,

Sep. 19. taking it "disdainfully," issued a second warrant, and sent troops to enforce its execution.[7]

Sep. 28. Hearing of their approach, Gorton forbade their setting foot upon his land; but the reply of the officers was, that they should attend their duty. Finding a collision was inevitable, the little colony prepared for resistance; but by the intervention of Providence friends, a parley was proposed. This, however, delayed matters but a short time.

[1] Simplicity's Defence, 21.
[2] Simplicity's Defence, 24–44.
[3] Winthrop, 2. 144–8; Simplicity's Def., 24, 45; Hutch. Coll., 131, 275–82; Cotton's Reply, 6; Mass. Rec's., 2. 38, 40.
[4] Simplicity's Defence, 46.
[5] 3 M. H. Coll., 1. 5–15.
[6] Simplicity's Defence, 45.
[7] Mass. Rec's., 2. 41; Winthrop, 3. 165–6; Simplicity's Def., 47; Cotton's Reply, 6; Johnson, in 2 M. H. Coll., 7. 50.

The fortress of the colonists was besieged, they were taken prisoners, and marched to Boston. Here they were paraded through the streets with great pomp; and, being committed to jail, at the next court they were called to answer to the charge of heresy. From the writings of Gorton, "twenty-six blasphemous particulars" were gathered; and, as he failed to clear himself to the satisfaction of the court, he was condemned as a blasphemer. The clergy were for passing a sentence of death; but the deputies dissented, and his life was spared. Yet the sentence of the party was a cruel one. They were confined with irons upon their legs, kept at work for their living, and their cattle and goods were taken to defray the expenses of the court.[1] CHAP. IX. Nov. 3. 1643.

At the spring court they were released! — because, forsooth, "we found they did corrupt some of our people, *especially the women*, by their heresies."[2] We suspect, however, there is truth in the suggestion of Gorton, that the people were dissatisfied with the severity of their sentence; and possibly the government may have heard of the appointment of the Earl of Warwick, as Governor-in-Chief of the Plantations in America, and it may have been feared that complaints would be made to him, and the affair become troublesome.[3] Mar. 7 1643-4.

Returning to Shaw-omet, there the liberated "heretics" remained for a time, and continued residents of the Rhode Island Colony after its charter was received; and, though frequently in collision with the people of Massachusetts, and never regarded with favor, they were comparatively unmolested, the shield of a higher power being thrown

[1] Simplicity's Def., 45, 49–75; Mass. Rec's., 2. 51, 52; Winthrop, 2. 168–177; Downing's Letter, in 3 M. H. Coll., 1. 15–16.

[2] Winthrop, 2. 178–9; Chalmers, Ann., 197.

[3] Simplicity's Def., 83–4. This whole affair, on the part of Massachusetts, was a stretch of authority, into which the magistrates were doubtless betrayed by their zeal for the suppression of heresy, and their fears of contamination from the proximity of the heretics.

CHAP. IX.

around them than that which emanated from a colonial court.[1]

There is little that is pleasant in the details of the present chapter, and we may be blamed for the plainness with which we have spoken. It is difficult at all times, especially where religious dissensions are the subject of inquiry, to discern the truth through the refractions of paradox, and contradictory extremes. Each party is inclined to favor its own side, and to cast opprobrium upon its opponents. We have endeavored to guard against the influence of prejudice, and to weigh in an even balance the statements of all. Doubtless the controversies of the seventeenth century were as important in the eyes of the generation then living, as the controversies of the nineteenth century are in our eyes. The form of discussion may be changed, but the subjects remain. And though it is difficult to interest ourselves strongly in what appear to be unintelligible subtleties, these subtleties were not cold abstractions, but earnest and solemn realities then; and men were as ready zealously to contend for them, as if the interests of time, as well as those of eternity, hung upon their decisions.

[1] The details of the controversy with Gorton, and the other inhabitants of Rhode Island, more properly belong to the history of the latter State, and are, therefore, omitted here. The interference of Massachusetts was unquestionably impolitic, if not unjust, and can only be accounted for on the grounds stated in the preceding note. For further particulars, see Mass. Archives; Mass. Records; and Mass. Hist. Coll's.

CHAPTER X.

LEGISLATION OF THE COLONY. DIFFICULTIES WITH ENGLAND.

THE civil history of every country is profoundly interesting, as a development of the progress of mind in the sublime science of government; and State and National laws are criteria of that progress, discovering, to the philosophic observer, the different steps by which, as virtue and intelligence increase, communities advance to higher and still higher degrees of freedom and improvement. Especially has the jurisprudence of the Massachusetts Commonwealth peculiar claims upon our attention, as unfolding the principles and policy of the founders of that Commonwealth. The Charter of Charles I. was the cherished palladium of their rights; its broad seal was the sanction of the authority which was exercised; and it was the intention of the grantees, under its provisions, to frame their laws, so far as practicable, in harmony with the laws of the land of their birth.

With the Puritans, however, *religion* was the basis of civil as well as of ecclesiastical government. "The Lord is our Judge, the Lord is our Lawgiver, the Lord is our King," was practically their motto;[1] and, planting themselves upon the position that, "when a commonwealth hath liberty to mould his own frame, the Scripture hath given full direction for the ordering of the same, and that in such sort as may best maintain the *euexia* of the church," they "fashioned the hangings to the house, and not the house to the hangings," and held that it was "better the common-

[1] 1 M. H. Coll., 5. 187; Hutch. Coll., 179.

CHAP. X.

wealth be fashioned to the setting forth of God's house, which is his church, than to accommodate the church frame to the civil estate.[1]

True, the faith of our fathers in the five points of Calvinism, was much firmer than their faith in the five points of a "strong government:" — an hereditary monarchy, an order of nobility, an established church, a standing army, and a military police; — yet there was an intimate intertexture of Church and State in their government; though the church, with them, was not, as in England, subordinate to the government, the dependent creature of the secular power; the government, on the contrary, was rather subordinate to the church, and was moulded to secure the being and the welfare of the church.[2] Hence, in our investigations into the civil policy of the colony, we shall find the principles of the Puritans lying at the basis of all their legislation; and many things, which have been often regarded as inexplicable, or for which they have been severely and bitterly reproached, were chiefly the result of the circumstances in which they were placed, and the opinions which they had adopted.

By the terms of their charter, the lands they held were deemed exclusively their own; and they claimed the right to receive or exclude strangers at their own discretion. "If we here be a corporation," said they, "established by free consent; if the place of our cohabitation be our own; then no man hath right to come in to us without our consent." Hence, intending to build up an exclusively Puri-

Sept. 7, 1630.

tan community, one of their earliest acts was, to provide that no person should plant at any place within the limits of the patent, without leave from the Governor and Assist-

[1] Cotton's Way, 27, and Letter, in Hutchinson, 1. 437; Johnson, in 2 M. H. Coll., 4. 27; Oakes's Election Sermon, 1673; Bacon's Hist. Disc., 18, 25.

[2] Higginson's Election Sermon, 1663, p. 19.

ants, or the major part of them.[1] And by a still more stringent regulation, at a later date an order was passed prohibiting the harboring of persons whose religious views were considered "dangerous," or the letting to such a lot or house, without the permission of one of the standing Council, or two of the Assistants.[2] This statute was zealously opposed by Sir Henry Vane; but Governor Winthrop, in his reply, says: "The intent of the law is to preserve the welfare of the body; and for this end to have none received into any fellowship with us who are likely to disturb the same, and this intent, I am sure, is lawful and good."[3] Thus was thrown up the first bastion of defense.

May 17, 1637.

The second soon followed. As no terms of admission to the Company were prescribed by the charter, the colonists held in their own hands the key to their asylum; and it was accordingly ordered, "to the end the body of the commons may be preserved of honest and good men, that, for the time to come, no man shall be admitted to the freedom of this body politic, but such as are members of some of the churches of the same." This was indeed a singular law, copied by the New Haven Colony, and virtually for a time by that at Rhode Island;[4] and it continued substantially in force until 1692, being repealed in appearance only after the restoration of Charles II.[5] It was condemned by Roger Williams, in his controversy with the magistrates;[6] and Episcopalians complained that, under its operations, liberty was jeopardized, and justice defeated.[7]

May 18, 1631.

[1] Mass. Rec's., 1. 76; Johnson, W. W. Prov., in 2 M. H. Coll., 7, ch. 22; Winthrop, in Hutch. Coll., 68; Chalmers, Ann., 678. Several of the Towns adopted similar regulations. See Frothingham's Chas'n., Felt's Salem, &c., &c.

[2] Mass. Rec's., 1. 196, 228; Winthrop, 1. 267.

[3] Hutch. Coll., 67–100, 216.

[4] 2 M. H. Coll., 7. 77.

[5] Hutchinson, 1. 31.

[6] Bloudy Tenet, 287.

[7] Lechford, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 81; Winthrop, 2. 348, 357; Hutch. Coll., 191–2.

CHAP. X. 1631.

And if it is regarded solely as a measure for the promotion of piety, there can be no doubt that it must be pronounced an unfortunate mistake; for piety cannot be promoted by making it the basis of civil or political distinctions. But we apprehend the true reason of this law has been generally overlooked. It was more a *political* regulation than a *sectarian* scruple. Not to bestow honors or privileges on *piety* was it passed, but to guard *liberty*,—to prevent encroachments upon their infant commonwealth. [1] The Puritans of Massachusetts recognized no rights founded upon Asiatic or European notions of indelible hereditary excellence; no distinctions based exclusively upon talent or wealth; yet necessarily, for a time, they were compelled to adopt the policy which excluded them from the Anglican Church, and erected a commonwealth of chosen people in covenant with God, in which the humblest freeholder, if sound in faith, possessed a power as great, in the election of magistrates and the enactment of laws, as a peer of the realm, or the proudest lord spiritual in the land of their birth.

It may possibly be true that there were evils connected with this policy. It vested undue power in the clergy and the church. It established a practical oligarchy of select religious votaries. It debarred from the exercise of the elective franchise all, however honest, who were unwilling to conform to the standard of colonial orthodoxy. But at the same time, we doubt whether, in an age of so general exclusiveness, when all large bodies of Christians were more or less intolerant, and each was struggling for the ascendancy, and for temporal dominion, and only isolated, individual minds, were acting on a broader plane; we doubt whether a different policy could have been safely adopted, without subjecting the colonists to what they

[1] Cotton, in Hutchinson, 1. 437; Davenport, in Bacon's Disc., 33.

would have regarded as the greatest of all evils, — the intrusion of a body of men inimical to their views, whose aim would have been to subvert their church and destroy their government. CHAP. X.

One other law remained to be enacted to complete their circumvallation. "Upon intelligence of some Episcopal and malignant practices against the country," an oath was framed, to be administered to every male resident twenty years old and upwards, not a freeman, acknowledging subjection to the colonial government, and promising obedience and conformity to the same. The design of this law is obvious. It was to secure the allegiance of all not entitled to the immunities of citizenship.[1] Apr. 1 1634.

Three laws like the foregoing, would probably be now regarded as eminently restrictive, exclusive and oppressive. But it must not be inferred from this that they were never of any service. On the contrary, to our minds, the course of the Puritans was at least as wise as that of the English Church. It was not a retaliatory, but a defensive policy which was adopted here; and the laws being necessarily temporary, as the colony grew in strength and wisdom, and as its own circumstances, and the circumstances of the English Church changed, they were abrogated in course.[2]

The *frame* of the government of the colony was fixed by the charter. By its terms, the principal officers were to be chosen directly by the freemen; but, as no rule was given how they should be elected, it was ruled that the freemen should choose the Assistants, and the Assistants from among themselves the Governor and Deputy.[3] This change, however, which established an elective aristocracy, with no limitation of the tenure of office, was too anti- Oct. 19, 1630.

[1] Mass. Rec's., 1. 115, 117, 137; Winthrop, 1. 152; Cotton's Tenet Washed, 4, 28–9; Felt's Ipswich, 20, &c.

[2] 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 399; N. Am. Rev., 44. 521–2.

[3] Mass. Rec's., 1. 79.

CHAP. X.

republican for the mass of the people; and, fearing they had yielded too much, the next spring an order was passed May 18, 1631. that once a year, at least, it should be lawful for the "commons" to propound any persons they desired to have chosen Assistants, and that the like course should be pursued when they saw cause to remove one or more of that May 9, 1632. body; and at the next court, to limit the tenure of office, it was agreed that the Governor, the Deputy, and the Assistants, should all be chosen anew every year by the Apr. 7, 1636. whole court. A few years later, it was provided that a portion of the magistrates should be chosen for life; but this arrangement awakened jealousy, and was soon abandoned.[1]

The substitution of delegates to represent the freemen, was an early and an important change, completing and consolidating the power of the commonwealth. A tax had Feb., 1631-2. been assessed on Watertown, and a warrant being issued for its collection, the pastor and elder of the church declared, that "it was not safe to pay money after that sort, for fear of bringing themselves and their posterity into bondage." Being called to an account for this "offense," they urged that the government was "no other but as of mayor and aldermen, who have not power to make laws or raise taxations without the people." To this the magistrates replied, that the government was "rather in the nature of a parliament, and that, as the freemen chose the Assistants, they were their representatives, and were authorized to act on their behalf." But the people were not satisfied with this decision, and "every town chose two May 8, 1632. men to be at the next court to advise with the governor and assistants about the raising of a public stock, so as what they should agree upon should bind all."[2]

[1] Mass. Rec's., 1. 87, 95, 264; Winthrop, 1. 219–20, 363–4; Hutchinson, 1. 433–6; Hubbard, 244.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 84, 91; Mass. Rec's., 1. 95; Hubbard, 156–7.

CHAP. X.

Two years later, two persons from each town were deputed, to meet and consider of such matters as they were to take order in at the next General Court; and having met, they "desired a sight of the patent," and "conceiving thereby that all laws should be made at the general court," they "repaired to the governor to advise with him about it," who "told them that, when the patent was granted, the number of freemen was so small as they might all join in making laws, but now they were so many they must choose others for that purpose;" yet, as a "select committee would be necessary to intend that work," they were advised at the next court to "order that once a year, a certain number should be appointed to revise all laws, &c., and that no assessment should be laid upon the country, nor any lands disposed of, without their consent."

The freemen, however, were little disposed to accept that as a favor, which they claimed as a right; and at the meeting of the Court, twenty-four delegates appeared and took their seats. Thus a House of Representatives, the second in America, — that of Virginia being the first, — was introduced and established. Quietly and without tumult was this measure effected; and though not expressly provided for in the charter, it was held not to be contrary to its letter or its spirit.[1] Five years later, the magistrates attempted to reduce the number of Deputies from each town to two; but this step was displeasing to the people, and the original number of three was restored.[2]

May 14, 1634.

Mar. 13, 1638-9.

The relative power of the Assistants and the Deputies was for some time undetermined, and a discussion upon the point was caused by the request of the people of Newtown for liberty to remove to Connecticut. Fifteen of the

Sep. 4, 1634.

[1] Mass. Rec's., 1. 117–18; Winthrop, 1. 152–4; Hubbard, 155–7; 3 M. H Coll., 8. 202–3.

[2] Legislative Papers, vol. 1. fols. 8, 11, 26; Winthrop, 1. 361–3; Mass. Rec's., 1. 254. In the house of deputies, the towns took their places of precedence according to their antiquity. Mass. Rec's., 3. 2.

CHAP. X. Deputies, with the Governor, and two of the Assistants, were in favor of granting this request; and ten Deputies, and the rest of the Assistants were opposed; "whereupon no record was entered, because there were not six Assistants in the vote as the patent required." The Deputies, alarmed at this decision, stood upon their rights; the Assistants were equally tenacious of theirs. For many years the controversy continued; the authority of the assistants being maintained, "not by prodigies, or other arts, used by the people of Rome," but sometimes by a wise delay, and sometimes by a "judicious sermon;" until finally, a compromise divided the court into two branches, and gave to each a negative upon the other.[1]

This conflict of political opinion is worthy of notice. It is a remarkable feature in the history of our State, that, from the outset of its career, the two necessary elements of a popular government have ever been prominent; and, from the freedom with which they have been exercised, are we doubtless to attribute the perfection and stability of our present institutions. Conservatism alone tends to arrogance and despotism. Radicalism alone tends to anarchy and ruin. The happy admixture of the two, is the foundation of that system of checks and balances, which, while it prevents the perpetuation of obsolete laws, guards against the enactment of those which are cruder, and which experience may prove to be injurious or utopian.

Previous to 1635, the colony had no body of laws regularly framed. But the increase of the population leading to apprehension of danger from the want of positive statutes, four of the magistrates were deputed, to make a draught in "resemblance to a Magna Charta," which, being allowed by the ministers and the general court, were

May 6, 1635.

[1] Legislative Papers, vol. 1. fol. 7, 134–5; Minot, 1. 27; Bancroft, 3; Winthrop, 1. 168–9; Mass. Rec's., 2. 58–9; Hutchinson, 1. 46–1. 365.

to be received for fundamental laws. It was six years, however, before this code was completed, when a body of one hundred laws, principally compiled by the Rev. Nathaniel Ward, of Ipswich, was established, which was called "The Body of Liberties." These laws were revised at different periods, and were collected and published in 1648, 1660, 1672, and at other times.[1] CHAP. X. Dec., 1641.

Much ridicule has been cast upon the colonists for the adoption of these laws, and it has been asserted that they are a "literal transcript of the laws of Moses." But even if this is admitted, such predilection for the Mosaic polity was not confined to Massachusetts, nor was it peculiar to the Puritans. The Presbyterians of Scotland, asserted the obligation of the judicial laws of the Pentateuch, at least in criminal cases, and deduced therefrom the duty of executing idolators, adulterers, witches, and Sabbath breakers. Nay, even before their days, passages as strong as any in Puritan writings might be quoted from the writings of the early reformers.[2] Hence, if it is admitted that the legislation of the colony was based upon the Mosaic polity, the Puritans were not alone in favoring that polity. Nor is it surprising that the settlers of Massachusetts should have been attracted by the legislation of the Hebrew Commonwealth. The statutes of Moses were given to a nation emigrating from the bondage of Egypt to the Canaan of promise. They were designed for a free people, subject only to God. And their purpose was to preserve, in purity and simplicity, the worship of the Most High. Our fathers, therefore, might naturally be drawn to these laws, by their reverence for God, and the coincidence between their situation and that of the Jews.

It is not, however, true, that the Mosaic polity was the

[1] Winthrop, and the Mass. Rec's. Also Hutch. Coll.; Force, vol. 3, Tract 9; 3 M. H. Coll., 8.; Hubbard, 246; and the Charter and Laws published by order of the State.

[2] Hallam, Const. Hist., 126.

CHAP. X. only law of New England; nor is it true that Massachusetts rejected the wisdom of English legislation. On the contrary, its Body of Liberties, taken as a whole, may fearlessly challenge comparison with the cotemporary legislation of England or any other land. Such a comparison was long ago instituted;[2] and, from its perusal, no one can doubt that our fathers were familiar with Magna Charta, and that the "Fundamentals" of Massachusetts were not regarded as conflicting with the same. And well might they say, in 1646, in repelling the charge of arbitrary government, illimited oaths, unjust taxes, illegal commitments, and others of a like nature: "Let them produce any colony or Commonwealth in the world, where more hath been done in sixteen years. Let them show where hath been more care and strife to prevent all arbitrariness, and to bring all judgments to a certain rule, so far as may be." Indeed, they had no reason to be ashamed of their laws; nor had they any reason to fear a comparison with the laws even of England. Let a few instances suffice to illustrate this statement.

In the "judicials" of Mr. Cotton, nineteen offenses are capital; in the "Body of Liberties," twelve; while in England, at the same time, one hundred and fifty offenses were punishable with death. Ample protection was thrown around the life, honor, liberty and property of every citizen. Extra judicial oaths were abolished. Impressment for wars without the colonies was prohibited. No monopolies, save patents on new inventions, were to be granted. All lands and heritages, were to be free from fines, and licenses upon alienations, and from heriots, wardships, liveries, primer-seizins, year day, waste, escheat, forfeitures, and the whole train of feudal exactions customary upon the death of parents or ancestors: — yet the disposition of property,

[1] Hutch. Coll., 200-08.

by will or otherwise, was carefully secured, and guarded against impositions and frauds. Hereditary claims being rejected, the laws of primogeniture and entail were so far modified, that the eldest son was only entitled to a double portion of the paternal estate, and the other sons, if the father died intestate, drew equal portions, after setting off the portion of the eldest. The rights of the widow were respected, and relief was afforded in case of neglect; and daughters inherited as copartners in default of male issue. The shield of the law was thrown around orphans; and the liberties of servants and foreigners were carefully defined. People of other Christian nations, professing the true Christian religion, and fleeing to the colony from the tyranny and oppression of their persecutors, or from famine or war, were to be entertained and succored, "according to that power and prudence God shall give us." Spoliation of the property of shipwrecked mariners was prohibited, and a refuge was provided for the sufferers. Bond-slavery, villanage, and captive vassalage, were permitted only in the case of "lawful captives taken in just war, and such strangers as willingly sell themselves, or are sold to us." Yet even such were "to have all the liberties and christian usages which the law of God established in Israel required." The detestable practice of wife whipping was prohibited; though "chastisement" might be administered by the authority of the court, where just cause for correction existed. Torture, too, the *peine forte et dure* of the English law, was prohibited, except in capital cases, after conviction, for the discovery of confederates; and even then, it was "not to be barbarous or inhuman." But, though the statutes say: "for bodily punishments, we allow amongst us none that are inhuman, cruel, or barbarous," cropping the ears, slitting the nose, branding the cheek, and whipping at the cart's tail were permitted, though such inflictions, if cotemporary history is to be credited, were less frequent here

CHAP. X. 1641.

CHAP. X. 1641.

than in England. In ordinary cases, the severest punishment to which criminals were subjected, was "to be whipped with forty stripes;" but it is gravely added, that "no true gentleman, nor any man equal to a gentleman, was to be punished with whipping, unless his crime was very shameful, and his course of life vicious and profligate."

Such is a faithful abstract of the "Body of Liberties;" and, though temporary laws were subsequently enacted conflicting with the above, they were only designed to meet specific exigencies. In no country, we may truly say, was the moral condition of the people higher than in New England. Even Lechford, an Episcopalian, and no friend to the civil or ecclesiastical government of the colony, frankly says: "Profane swearing, drunkenness, and beggars are but rare in the compass of this patent."[1] The Inspectors, in their Official report to Charles II., in 1673, say: "The worst cottages of New England are lofted; there are no beggars, and not three persons are put to death annually for theft."[2] "The air of New England," says Vincent, in closing his account of the Pequot War, "and the diet, equal if not excelling that of Old England: besides, their honor of marriage, and careful preventing and punishing of furtive congression, giveth them and us no small hope of their future puissance and multitude of subjects. Herein, saith the wise man, consisteth the strength of a king, and likewise of a nation or kingdom."[3]

It would hardly be fair to contrast with this picture the cotemporary condition of down trodden Ireland, which James I. considered as his "master piece." But, at the risk of being considered a little invidious, we may furnish one extract from the Journal of the faithful Evelyn, relating to England itself. "Aug. 2, 1664. Went to Uppingham, the shire town of Rutland; pretty and well built of

[1] In 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 86.
[2] 1 M. H. Coll., 4, 117; Chalmers, Ann.; Walsh's Appeal, 74.
[3] 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 42.

stone, which is a rarity in that part of England, where most of the rural villages are built of mud, and the people living as wretchedly as the most impoverished parts of France, which they much resemble, being idle and sluttish. The country, (especially Leicestershire,) much in common; the gentry free drinkers."[1]

While the colonists were thus perfecting the civil policy of their infant commonwealth, their singular and unprecedented career was regarded with amazement by some, and with envy by others. At first, Charles inclined to treat them with benevolent platitude; and their friends, apprehensive of extraordinary disturbances from their proceedings, looked on with anxiety as the horoscope of their own destiny was being cast at home. But the dragon's teeth were sown, and a harvest of enemies was the speedy result. The stern discipline of Endicott, in expelling the Brownes, awakened, not unnaturally, suspicions that the new community was not to be the sanctioned home of Episcopacy. Morton of Merry Mount was the avowed enemy of the plantation. The deserters of 1630, accused the settlers of 1630.
being "Brownists in religion, and ill affected to the English government." Linne, who was whipped in 1631, 1631.
added to the list of accusers and defamers.[2] And a "thousand eyes were watching over them to pick a hole in their coats."[3]

To their former enemies, two more were soon added:— Philip Ratcliffe, a servant of Mr. Cradock, who was convicted of uttering "malicious and scandalous speeches against the government, and the church of Salem," was fined £40, and sentenced to be "whipped, lose his ears, and be banished the plantation;"[4] and Sir Christopher

[1] Evelyn, Mem., vol 1, in Walsh's Appeal, 74.
[2] Winthrop, 1. 73.
[3] Lett. of E. Howes, in 3 M. H. Coll., 9. 244.
[4] Mass. Rec's., 1. 88; Winthrop, 1. 67–8; Hubbard, 137, 141, 149; R. Clap, in Chron. Mass., 362; T. Morton, N. Eng. Can., 112–13.

CHAP. X. Gardiner, a "Knight of the Sepulchre," accused as a papist in disguise, and a bigamist and adulterer, who was seized for his offenses, and expelled from the colony.[1] From the fact that letters shortly after reached Boston, from Sir Ferdinando Gorges, addressed to Gardiner and Morton, both are supposed to have been in his employ; and, however friendly that nobleman may have formerly been to Massachusetts, a change seems to have come over the spirit of his dream, and he, with Capt. John Mason, both prominent members of the Council for New England, who had expended many thousand pounds in fruitless attempts at colonization, were now jealous of the Colony, and envious of its success; and, with Morton and Ratcliffe to assist in their plans, the vindictive complaints of former accusers were loudly echoed, and a petition was preferred to the
1632. Lords of the Privy Council, urging the "distractions and disorders in the colony," and demanding that its charter should be recalled and annulled.[2]

From the known religious opinions of the complainants, and the professed opinions of those who abetted them, it hardly admits of doubt that the *gravamen* of the charges against the colony, was an alleged opposition to Episcopacy and the Anglican Church; and the treatment of those who had been expelled from its jurisdiction was adduced in proof of such opposition. But it was easily proved, in the case of the chief offenders, that punishment was not inflicted upon them because they were of the Episcopal Church, but because they were insubordinate to the colonial government; and Charles had discretion enough to see where the truth lay. Through the intervention of friends, therefore, especially Emanuel Downing, and Capt. Wig-

[1] Dudley, in Chron. Mass., 333; Winthrop, 1. 65–8; Hubbard, 149–53; Morton's Mem., 85; T. Morton, 121–2; 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 378, and 8. 321.

[2] Hubbard, 141, 145–6.

gins,[1] these attempts were frustrated, and an order was issued, which encouragingly says: "The appearances were so fair, and the hopes so great, that the country would prove both beneficial to this kingdom, and profitable to the particular Adventurers, as that the Adventurers had cause to go on cheerfully with their undertakings, and rest assured, that if things were carried as was pretended when the Patents were granted, and according as by the Patents is appointed, his Majesty would not only maintain their liberties and privileges heretofore granted, but supply anything further that might tend to the good government of the place, and prosperity, and comfort to his people there." [2] CHAP. X. Jan. 19, 1652-3.

Tidings of this first conspiracy reached Boston a month after the Order of Council issued; and in the meantime, the plantation was "preached against at Paul's Cross;" scandalous reports continued to be circulated; and two or three letters from individual colonists, who, in the effervescence of their zeal, denounced England as a "Babel and a Sodom," added fuel to the already formidable flame. It was not "a Spanish powder plot, nor an accounted invincible Armada, but a Spanish like French infection," against which the colony had now to contend; and their deliverance was esteemed "almost miraculous." But, happily, Saltonstall, Humphrey, and Cradock, proved able defenders of their absent associates; Mr. Edward Howes, a "daily and hourly auditor and spectator of all the passages" of the trial, bears honorable testimony to their zeal;[3] Francis Kirby speaks favorably of their efforts;[4] and upon a representation of their defense to the King, by Sir Thomas Jermayn, one of his Council, his Majesty was Feb. 22.

[1] See his Letters, in 3 M. H. Coll., 8. 320–4.

[2] Hubbard, 151–2, 703; Morton's Mem., 87–8; Winthrop, to Gov. Bradford, in Hutch. Coll., 52–4; Hutchinson, 1. 36; Hazard, 1. 324–5; N. E. Gen. Reg., 8. 136.

[3] Letter, in 3 M. H. Coll., 9. 252–7.

[4] Letter, in 3 M. H. Coll., 9. 258–61.

CHAP. X.

pleased to say, "that he would have them severely punished which did abuse his governor and the plantation;" and the defendants were dismissed with an order for their encouragement, "being assured, from some of the Council, that his Majesty did not intend to impose the ceremonies of the Church of England upon them, as it was considered that it was the freedom from such things that made people come over to the colony."[1]

May, 1633. Jun. 19. Information of this second repulse reached Boston in May, and a day of thanksgiving being kept in consequence, in which Plymouth was requested to join,[2] an answer to the memorials of Gardiner was prepared, signed by the Governor, and all the Assistants except Mr. Dudley, and sent July. to England by Capt. Graves, with a certificate from the "old planters," certifying the loyalty of the colonists.[3]

Here matters might have rested, and the business of the colony have gone on prosperously, had not the arbitrariness of the King, and the increasing rigor of Laud, encouraged emigration to such an unparalleled extent, that "many of the best, both ministers and Christians," left England for America. This "breeding sad thoughts in those behind of the Lord's intention, and an apprehension of evil days to come upon England"—"a more ill-boding sign to the nation than the portentous blaze of comets, and the impressions in the air at which astrologers are dismayed"[4]—the Archbishops, and other dignitaries of the Church and of the Council, were alarmed; and, making of the matter a Feb. 21, 1633-4. "State affair," a warrant was issued to stay several vessels then in the Thames ready to sail for New England, and for

[1] Winthrop, 6. 119, 122–3; Hubbard, 154. This fact is worthy of notice, and is an offset to the statement of Hildreth, that, when the Massachusetts Charter was granted, nothing was said upon the subject of religion.

[2] Winthrop's Letter, in Hutch. Coll., 52.

[3] Winthrop, 1. 126.

[4] Milton, Book 2; Bancroft, 1. 406.

the patent of the Company to be brought to the Board.[1] The reply of Mr. Cradock was, that the charter was in America; and a letter advising the colonists of this warrant was sent to Boston. A meeting being called to consider the same, it was wisely concluded "not to return any answer or excuse to the Council at that time," as "it could not be done but by a general court, which was to be holden in September." Happily for the colonists, "the Ditch between England and their now place of abode was so wide, that they could not leap over with a lope-staff,"[2] and distance of situation and effluxion of time were of infinite service in foiling the intentions of their querimonious adversaries.

July, 1634.

The same year, a measure still more threatening was adopted. By a royal decree, a special commission was given, to the Archbishops of York and Canterbury, and ten others, fully empowering them, or any five of them, to regulate and govern the plantations of New England, temporally and spiritually; to call to an account, and remove at their discretion, and with the royal consent, all governors or presidents; and to examine all letters patent, suppressing the surreptitious, and revoking those trenching upon the prerogatives of royalty.[3] Three days after, a commission for a General Governor passed the Privy Seal, a Governor was chosen, and vessels were provided for his conveyance to the country.[4] These measures, in the estimation of even a pleader against the colonies, "exhibit a

Apr. 28, 1634.

May 1.

[1] Winthrop, 1. 161; Hubbard, 153, 703; Hazard, 1. 341–2; N. E. Gen. Reg., 8. 136–7, where are the names of the vessels detained. According to Hubbard, 154, the Letter from Lord Say and Seal, published in Hutchinson, 1. 433, arrived about this time, as also letters from Ireland, signifying the intention of many there to remove hither. See also Savage's Winthrop, 1. 160; Mass. Recs., vol. 1.; Mather, b. i. c. v. s. 7; Chron. Mass., 402–4; Coffin's Newbury, 12–13.

[2] Johnson, in 2 M. H. Coll., 2. 70.

[3] Winthrop, 1. 171; Hubbard, 264–8, 698–702; Hutchinson, 1. 440–2; Chalmers, 158–9; Hazard, 1. 344–7; 1 M. H. Coll., 4. 119.

[4] Winthrop, 1. 171, 192; Hubbard, 169, 428, 703.

CHAP. X.

true picture of the violent administration during this reign;" and the "royal edict" is condemned, as "inconsistent with every salutary principle of just government," and "contrary to that law which the petition of right had been so lately enacted to secure and enforce."[1] Is it surprising, then, that they aroused indignation in America? The news of such arbitrary proceedings, and the arrival of a boasting letter from Morton of Merry Mount, to his "good gossip" Jeffries, filled with "reviling speeches and threats against the plantation,"[2] produced great excitement; and provisions having been made for the erection of a fort at Boston, and another at Castle Island, with entrenchments at Dorchester and Charlestown,[3] the magistrates and deputies hastened the completion of the same, appropriating £600 for the purpose; and, forgetting personal piques in zeal for the public prosperity, they "discovered their minds to each other," and all the ministers save Mr. Ward of Ipswich being present at Boston, and the question propounded, What shall be done if a General Governor be sent over to us from England? — with the sturdy spirit of Saxon independence, "all agreed that, if a General Governor was sent, we ought not to accept him, but defend our lawful possessions, if we are able; and otherwise to avoid or protract."

Jan. 19, 1634-5.

1634. In the fall of this year, Mr. Edward Winslow, of Plymouth, was sent to England as joint agent for the colonies of Plymouth and Massachusetts, to obtain a commission to withstand the intrusions of the French and the Dutch, at the East and at the West; and, at his hearing before the Lords, the petition sent by him found good

[1] Chalmers, Ann, 159.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 164; Hubbard, 169, 427–30; Hutchinson, 1. 35; Hazard, 1. 342–3.

[3] Mass. Rec's., 1. 105, 108, 110, 123, 124, 136, 139; Winthrop, 1. 92, 140, 157, 163–4, 166; Johnson, in 2 M. H. Coll., 3. 138–9; Josselyn, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 378, &c., &c.

[4] Winthrop, 1. 171, 183; Belknap's N. H., 1. App., xvii.

acceptance with most of them, and especially were they inclined to favor it, because a way was pointed out by which it might be effected without charge to the Crown. But this crossed the purposes of Gorges and Mason; and, as the Archbishop of Canterbury was, at that time, concocting his project of sending a General Governor to America, at the request of Gorges, Morton of Merry Mount appeared as the accuser of the colonies; but his accusations were so successfully answered by Mr. Winslow, and the conduct of the magistrates so triumphantly vindicated, that the Board "checked Morton, and rebuked him sharply, and also blamed Gorges and Mason for countenancing him." But Laud was not so easily baffled; and, as Morton had charged Mr. Winslow with exercising the functions of the ministry without being episcopally ordained, and with marrying while he held only a commission as a justice of the peace, on being questioned of the truth of these allegations, he frankly confessed that "sometimes, wanting a minister, he did exercise his gifts to help the edification of his brethren;" and that, "about marriage, it was a civil thing, and he nowhere found in the word of God that it was tied to a minister." These answers were enough to arouse the latent malignity of the prelate; and, by his vehement importunity, an order was passed for Mr. Winslow's commitment to the Fleet, where he was confined four months before he was liberated.[1]

Yet, notwithstanding the rigorous policy of the Crown, emigrants continued to leave ill-governed England, and to flock by hundreds to the American stand; and several persons, whom the bishops were anxious to restrain, being on the eve of embarking, an order was sent to the Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports and other Haven Towns, "for the

Dec., 1634.

[1] Winthrop, 1. 163; Hubbard, Morton, 179; Hutchinson, 2. 409; 703; Morton's Mem., 94; Davis's N. E. Gen. Reg., 2. 242.

CHAP. X.

stopping of promiscuous and disorderly departing out of the realm."[1] This step, however, produced less commotion in the colony than another, far more portentous, which speedily followed. The New England Council, a proud company of several years standing; whose affairs were conducted by philosophers, with Sir Kenelm Digby at their head; and whose legal proceedings were advised by Sir Henry Spelman, one of the most eminent jurists of that day; this distinguished body, long involved in controversies with the rival Virginia Company, and an inexorable Parliament, and the execution of whose projects had never corresponded to the grandeur with which they were conceived, was now in its dotage, and on the point of dissolution from its own debility. Its members, anticipating so melancholy an event, had some years before provided for its contingency by cantoning the whole country embraced in their patent into twelve petty Lordships, from the St. Croix to Maryland, partitioning it into distinct portions, to be enjoyed by themselves in severalty;[2] and now, at the instance
April, 1635. of Gorges and Mason, they were ready to surrender the Great Patent, on condition of the confirmation of the divisions which had been made. This was their last *coup d' etat;* and, as the documents show that one of their motives was the overthrow of the Massachusetts Colony, the history of their scheme merits a more ample development.

The meeting for the discussion of this subject was held
Apr. 25. at the chamber of the Earl of Carlisle, at Whitehall; and a "Declaration" was drawn up, setting forth their "reasons" for the "resignation of the Great Charter." After briefly alluding to the faithful but fruitless endeavors of some of the Council for the advancement of the plantation

[1] Winthrop, 1. 206; Hubbard, 703; Hazard, 1. 347–8.

[2] Gorges, in 3 M. H. Coll., 6. 83; Smith, in 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 21; Winthrop, 1. 192; Hubbard, 88–9, 226–33; Chalmers, Revolt, 1. 56; Hazard, 1. 388; Thornton's Landing, &c.

of New England, and to the "strange litigious questions" with which they had been assaulted by the Virginia Company, and the claims of the French ambassador for a portion of their territory,—following which there "only remained a Carcass, in a manner breathless,"—they refer to the application of the Massachusetts Company for a patent; and, falsely alleging that this grant was fraudulently and surreptitiously obtained, they assert, that the "intruders" as fraudulently, after driving out the former grantees, procured a confirmation of their patent of the King, and made themselves a free people, rending in pieces the first foundation of the building, framing unto themselves "new laws and new conceits of matters of religion, and forms of ecclesiastical government," and punishing "divers that would not approve thereof, some by whipping, and others by burning their houses over their heads, and some by banishing," so as to "make themselves absolute masters of the country, and unconscionable in their new laws." The aggrieved parties, they then add, applied to the Council for redress; but that body being unable to give them suitable satisfaction, they petitioned the King for relief, who referred them to the Lords of the Privy Council, who summoned the members of the New England Council to give account by what authority, or by whose means these people were sent over; but they "easily made it appear that they had no hand in the evils committed, and wholly disclaimed having had any hand therein," and "humbly referred to their Lordships to do what might best sort with their wisdom; who found matters in so desperate a case, as that they saw a necessity for his Majesty to take the whole business into his own hands."

CHAP. X.

For these reasons, the resignation of the Charter was agreed to; and, after presenting to the King the "Humble Petition of Edward, Lord Gorges, President of the Council of New England, in the name of himself and divers Lords

May 2, 1635.

CHAP. X. and others of the said Council," praying him to "order Mr. Attorney General to draw Patents" for confirmation June 7, 1635. of their several parcels of land, a formal Act of Surrender was executed, giving up "all and every the liberties, licenses, powers, privileges, and authorities therein granted."[1]

Such were the circumstances attending the surrender of the Great Patent, and the dissolution of the Company from which so much had been expected, and by which so little had been performed. The colonists, advised of the dangers to which they were exposed, were in a state of perplexity; the rumor of a General Governor was renewed; and it was even said that a ship had been prepared, which was to forward that dreaded functionary to America, but in launching, "she turned on one side and broke her back;" and the death of Mason occurring soon after, Gorges withdrew from the contest, and there the matter ended.[2]

Yet the interval of repose to the colonies was comparatively transient, for the next year the machinations of their adversaries were renewed. Though some of the Privy Council were their friends, the King and Laud were their bitter 1636. opposers; and at the Trinity term, the Attorney General, Sir John Banks, filed an Information against the Massachu- Jun. 17. setts Company; a Quo Warranto issued, directed to the Sheriffs of London, against the Company; and fourteen of the members, besides Mr. Cradock, appearing at the ensuing Michælmas, and at other times, judgment was given that none of them should, "for the future, intermeddle with any of the liberties, privileges, or franchises aforesaid," but should be forever excluded from all use and claim of the same, and every of them; Mr. Cradock was

[1] Hazard, 1. 390–5; Hubbard, 272.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 192, 223; 2. 14; Hubbard, 180, 233; Hazard, 1. 347, 403; D'Ewes Autobiog.; 4 M. H. Coll., 1. 250; Belknap's N. H., 1. App., p. xv.

convicted of the usurpation charged in the Information, and held to answer to the King; and "the said liberties, privileges, and franchises," were "taken and seized into the King's hands." "The rest of the patentees stood outlawed, and no judgment entered up against them."[1] Under ordinary circumstances, this would have been equivalent to a revocation of the charter; but the whole affair was so bunglingly managed on the part of the Crown, that, in 1678, two eminent lawyers, Jones and Winnington, gave it as their official opinion, that the Quo Warranto was not "so brought, nor the judgment thereupon so given, as could cause a dissolution of the said Charter;" and hence that instrument remained unrevoked.[2] CHAP. X.

The persecuting policy of Charles towards the colonies, and the state of turmoil and perplexity into which his mind was cast at this time, are evident from his repeated, and seemingly frantic attempts, to check the progress of emigration from the kingdom. The adage, "*Quem Deus vult perdere, prius dementat*," was strikingly exemplified in his case. Order followed Order, and Warrant followed Warrant, in quick and rapid succession. A few months after the Quo Warranto issued, an Order was sent to the Lord Admiral, to "stop ministers unconformable to the discipline and ceremonies of the Church," from transporting themselves "to the Sumer Islands, and other his Majestie's plantations abroad;"[3] and this was followed by another, to the officers of the ports in England, Wales, and Berwick, "against the disorderly transporting his Majestie's subjects to the Plantations within the parts of America."[4] Previously, a commission from the Chancery Court was sent to 1636. Apr. 30, 1637. Nov. 9, 1636.

[1] Hubbard, 268, 272, 707; Hutchinson, 1. 85; Coll., 101–05; Hazard, 1. 423–5; 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 97; Belknap, 1. App., xiii.

[2] Chalmers, Ann., 162, 439; Revolt, 1. 55; Story's Com., 1. 54.

[3] Rushworth, 2. 410; Hazard, 1. 420; Hubbard.

[4] Hubbard; Rymer, 20. 143; Hazard, 1. 421.

CHAP. X.

some private gentlemen in the colony, to examine witnesses in a cause there depending; but, through jealousy, "nothing was done in it, nor any return made."[1] Shortly after, a commission from the Commissioners for Plantations was issued to divers of the magistrates, "to govern all the people in New England until further order;" and a copy of the same was forwarded to Boston: but the original never arrived, staying "at the seal for want of paying fees."[2]

May 3, 1637. Next followed an Order of Council to the Attorney General, to call for the Massachusetts Patent; but no result was attained.[3] Sir Ferdinando Gorges was then appointed

July 2. Governor General of the country, and[4] a sub-commission was sent by him to several gentlemen in Massachusetts, to "govern his province of New Somersetshire;" but, being "observed as a matter of no good discretion," it was "passed over in silence."

Ere long, however, this series of persecutions was destined to end; and, after the issue of the Order to the Court

Feb. 4, 1637-8. of High Commission, the troubles in Scotland, which immediately sprung up, so completely occupied the time and attention of Charles and his Council, that they had "neither heart nor leisure to look much after New England's affairs," and the measure of sending a General Governor took no effect.[5] Yet, though the storm thickened around the head of the deluded monarch, a new Order was issued

Mar. 30, 1638. for the stay of eight ships then in the Thames, which are said — though the statement has been doubted — to have had on board Pym, Hampden, Haslerig, Cromwell, and others, subsequently conspicuous in the annals of the Long

Apr. 4. Parliament.[6] This was followed by a new Order for the

[1] Winthrop, 1. 244.
[2] Winthrop, 1. 269, 276.
[3] Hubbard, 272–3; Hutchinson, 1. 85; Belknap's N. H., 1. App., xiii; N. E. Gen. Reg., 8. 138.
[4] Winthrop, 1. 276, 317; Hubbard, 261, 707; Chalmers, Ann., 162.
[5] Winthrop, 1. 320.
[6] Winthrop, 1. 319–20; Rushworth, 2. 409; Hazard, 1. 422. The date of this Order is Mar. 30, 1638, in N. E. Gen. Reg., 8. 138, where are others of the same year.

Massachusetts Patent to be called in;[1] and two days after, by an Order for a Proclamation to prohibit the transportation of passengers to New England without license.[2] In the following month, this Proclamation appeared;[3] and a few months later, the warrant of 1636, to the Lord Admiral, to stop unconformable ministers was repeated.[4] CHAP. X. Apr. 6, 1638. May 1. Aug. 19.

Nor were there wanting enemies within the colony, employed as informers by enemies abroad. For some time, suspicions had been entertained of one Burdet,[5] a man of ill-name and ill-fame, infamous for incontinency, who passed as a clergyman, but who was in reality a spy of Laud. This man had sent to England various charges against the colonists, accusing them of aiming, "not at new discipline, but at sovereignty," and asserting, that "it was accounted treason in their general courts to speak of appeals to the king."[6] Capt. Underhill, and Hanserd Knollys, also, joined with Burdet in swelling the list of grievances.[7] In consequence of these charges, a letter from Thomas Meautis, Clerk of the Privy Council, was received at Boston, containing the Order for the return of the Patent;[8] and at the fall court,[9] a reply was drawn up, setting forth the reasons for not complying with this demand;—for it was sturdily resolved "not to be best to send back the patent, because their friends in England would conceive that it was surrendered, and therefore the colony would be bound to receive such a governor and such orders as might be sent to them, and many bad and weak minds would think it lawful, if not necessary, to accept a general governor." July? 1638. Sept.

[1] Winthrop, 1. 359–60; Hutch. Coll., 105; Hubbard, 268–9; Hazard, 1. 432–3.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 320; Rushworth, 2. 718; Hazard, 1. 433; N. E. Gen. Reg., 8. 139.

[3] Rymer, 20. 223; Hazard, 1. 434.

[4] Rushworth, 2. 721; Hazard, 1. 420.

[5] Winthrop, 1. 332; Hubbard, 221, 253; Belknap's N. H., 1. 36.

[6] Winthrop, 1. 338, 358–9; Hubbard, 263, 353–6; Hutchinson, 1. 85.

[7] Winthrop, 1. 369, 392–3; Hubbard, 351.

[8] Winthrop, 1. 329; Hubbard, 268–71.

[9] Winthrop, 1. 323–4, 329–30; Hubbard, 269–71.

CHAP. X. 1638.

In this document, a memorable specimen of skilful diplomacy, the colonists profess their willingness to yield all due obedience to the king, but say: "We came into these remote parts with his Majesty's license and encouragement, under his Great Seal of England, and in the confidence we had of the assurance of his favor, we have transported our families and estates; and if our patent should now be taken from us, many thousand souls will be exposed to ruin, being laid open to the injuries of all men; the rest of the plantations about us, if we leave the place, will for the most part dissolve and go with us, and then the whole country will fall into the hands of the French or the Dutch; if we should lose all our labor, and be deprived of those liberties which his Majesty hath granted us, and nothing laid to our charge, nor any failing found in point of allegiance, it will discourage all men hereafter from the like undertakings upon confidence of his Majesty's Royal Grant; and lastly, if our patent be taken from us, the common people will conceive that his Majesty hath cast them off, and that hereby they are freed from all allegiance and subjection, and therefore will be ready to confederate themselves under a new government, for their necessary safety and subsistence, which will be a dangerous example to other Plantations, and perilous to ourselves, of incurring his Majesty's displeasure, which we would by all means avoid."

For these reasons they supplicate a reconsideration of the Order, and ask to be "suffered to live here in this wilderness, and that the poor plantation, which hath found more favor with God than any others, may not find less favor with the King, nor their liberties be restrained, when others are enlarged, or the door be kept shut to them, while it stands open to all others, and that men of ability should be debarred from Massachusetts, while they have encouragement to other colonies." — "Let us then," say

they, in conclusion, "Let us be made the objects of his Majesty's clemency, and not cut off in our first appeal from all hopes of favor. Thus with our earnest prayers unto the King of Kings, for long life and prosperity to his Sacred Majesty, and his Royal family, and for all honor and welfare to your Lordships, we humbly take leave."[1]

This eloquent and effective Petition did not fail of its object; and soon after it reached England, a letter was sent by Mr. Cradock, informing the government that the Lords Commissioners had received and accepted it, and declared their intention to be only to regulate the plantations, and not to curtail their liberties, and giving full power to go on as usual, until a new patent was sent. Yet, at the same time, another Order was forwarded, peremptorily requiring the return of the Charter by the first ship, under threats of further and more stringent measures in case of non-compliance.[2] But this letter the colonists saw fit to pass over in silence; and the troubles supervening which terminated in the death of Charles, and the overthrow of royalty for a season, the storm, before which the colonists would have been compelled to bend or break, was happily averted; and for several years, no further attempts were made to obtain possession of their patent. Had not these troubles ensued, the infant commonwealth would have proved but a feeble barrier to the assaults of tyranny. The two or three regiments in the Bay, could muster but a thousand men;[3] and what were these to the tens of thousands who could have been sent to crush them? But the spirit of independence was aroused even at this period;

June, 1639.

[1] Hubbard, 269–71; Hutchinson, 1. App. 5; Hazard, 1. 435–6.
[2] Winthrop, 1. 359–67.
[3] Winthrop, 1. 358; Mass. Rec's. 186–7. The "Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company," was organized in 1637–8. Mass. Rec's., Winthrop, Hubbard, Whitman, &c.

CHAP. X. 1639.

the government was fast "hardening into a republic;" and a sturdy resistance to all encroachments was counselled by the pastors, and approved by the people.

It will be obvious to all who carefully investigate the history of the transactions described in this chapter, that, at a very early period, the success of the Massachusetts Colony awakened the jealousy of all who had failed in establishing similar settlements on these shores; and that advantage was artfully taken of the policy of the government, and the disaffection of a few insubordinate and unprincipled men, to circulate extravagant and ill-founded reports, representing the people as rebels and traitors; and, as the English nation itself was convulsed by the contest which had been long pending between Puritanism and Episcopacy, and the arbitrary measures of a tyrannical prince had exasperated the people, and aroused to resistance the friends of freedom, the mind of his Majesty and his principal councillors was easily poisoned against the colony, and no pains were spared, by one means or another, to accomplish its overthrow, and its utter subversion.

There is no evidence, we think, that the people of Massachusetts had resolved systematically to renounce all allegiance to England. Their views of allegiance, it is true, differed materially from those which generally obtained. But within their charter, and in accordance with its terms, and in harmony with those natural rights which were inalienably theirs, they cheerfully acknowledged dependance on the parent State; as Englishmen, they were proud of their nation and its honor; and if different views afterwards prevailed, or if their feelings became less cordial, and were gradually alienated and estranged, it is to be attributed more to the mistaken and persecuting policy which by ill-advice was adopted towards them, than to any inherent spirit of rebellion, or opposition or enmity to England and its government.

It should be borne in mind, likewise, by those who have maligned the motives, and aspersed the character of the founders of New England, and who delight to dwell upon the absurdities and monstrosities, which are the offspring as much of their own brains, as of the conduct of the Puritans, that all writers upon English History concur in condeming the arbitrary and unconstitutional measures of the Stuarts; and attribute, in part at least, the deliverance of the nation from the dominion of their tyranny, and the vindication of the rights and liberties of Englishmen, to the labors of the very sect instrumental in building up the liberties of America. And, in the midst of such arbitrary proceedings as were then grinding the nation into the dust, and which excited the abhorrence of all true patriots, ought it not rather to be spoken to the praise of the first settlers of Massachusetts, that the men who came here, under a Charter from the King, to which was appended that broad Seal regarded at home with an almost superstitious veneration, steadily resisted his unrighteous attempts to curtail their liberties, defeated the machinations of their persevering adversaries, and succeeded, in despite of all opposition, in spreading abroad throughout the whole land those distinguishing principles, which are the bulwark of the English Constitution, and which are the pride and the glory of the Constitution of the United States?

Between England and America there have been many misunderstandings, which have issued, unhappily, in bloodshed and misery. Their views and ours are not in all things coincident. But we are both sprung from one race; the blood of a common ancestry flows in our veins; we speak the same language, and are bound together by many ties of affinity and relationship. Is not that, then, a narrow policy, which seeks to foster a spirit of enmity and dissension? We, as Americans, may own without shame our affiliation with a country which has given birth to more

CHAP. X. greatness than any other nation of Europe; and England has no reason to look askance at America, for her children have not degenerated here, nor have they sullied that honor, or tainted that blood, which is the boast of both nations, and which should bind us together in friendship and peace.

CHAPTER XI.

THE CONFEDERACY OF THE COLONIES.

THE Confederacy of 1643, is an important event in the history of New England; and, as we purpose to make this event the basis of the present chapter, a general survey of the condition of the colonies will be an appropriate preliminary to its discussion, and will afford an opportunity for noting a few incidents which have been purposely passed over in our previous pages.

The idea of this Confederacy seems to have originated with the colony of Plymouth, during the Pequot war. That colony, when solicited to furnish men and means for the war, objected on the ground that their Massachusetts brethren had refused to aid them in their difficulties with the French; and in a conference at Boston, between the May 12, 1637. agents of Plymouth and the agents of Massachusetts, to promote harmony of action, proposals were made for an alliance, offensive and defensive, in all cases of future occurrence.[1] Nearly at the same time, similar proposals Apr. 1. were made by Massachusetts to the Hartford colony; but the latter, jealous it should seem of their prosperous predecessors, signified their unpreparedness to enter upon such negotiations, "in regard of their engagements to attend the answer of the gentlemen of Saybrook about the same matter."[2] A few months later, however, some of the magistrates and ministers of the colony being at Boston, to attend the Synod, a day was "appointed to agree upon Aug. 30.

[1] Winthrop, 1. 261.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 259.

CHAP. XI.

some articles of confederation, and notice was given to Plymouth that they might join in it, but their warning was so short as they could not come."[1]

Meanwhile the plantations in Connecticut, already of some importance, were strengthened by the accession of fresh bodies of emigrants from England; and, in addition to the Colony at Hartford, another was founded at "Quillipieck," by Theophilus Eaton, Edward Hopkins, Rev. John Davenport, Rev. Samuel Eaton, and others, gentlemen of respectability, influence and talent, a few of whom

Mar. 30, 1638.

went thither in the fall of 1637, and were followed by the rest the ensuing spring, who landed at "Red Hill," and, under the shadow of a spreading oak, laid the foundation of New Haven. Here they purchased land of the natives; the little settlement thrived apace; and continued under a

June 4, 1639.

plantation covenant about fourteen months, when a more systematic constitution was adopted, similar to that of Massachusetts.[2]

We have elsewhere noticed the settlement of Hartford, Wethersfield, Windsor, and Springfield.[3] As Massachusetts claimed jurisdiction over those of her inhabitants who had removed to Connecticut, and as the bounds between the colonies were not definitely fixed, in conjunction with Mr. John Winthrop, Jr., the agent of the English grantees, a commission was issued to Ludlow, Pynchon, Steele, and others, for the government of these plantations for one year;[4] but the settlers, impatient of external control, and satisfied that most, if not all of them, were without the limits of the Bay, established an independent government at the end of this year,[5] and subsequently entered into a

[1] Winthrop, 1. 283–4.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 283, 311–12, 484–6; Hubbard, 262–3, 317–19; Johnson, in 2 M. H. Coll., 7. 7; 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 165; Trumbull, 1. 95–97, 102–106, 502–506; Holmes, 1. 245, 252; Bacon's Hist. Disc., 18–24; Brodhead's N.Y., 294, &c.

[3] Chap. 8.

[4] Mass. Rec's., 1. 170–1; Hazard, 1. 321–2.

[5] Holmes, 1. 237.

combination among themselves, and became a body politic, by mutual consent, framing their own laws, and choosing their own officers, without, as in the elder colony, restricting the freedom of the elective franchise to the members of their churches.[1] Jan. 14, 1638-9.

Difficulties early arose between this colony and that of Massachusetts, growing out of the "shyness" of the former; and, as the Articles of Confederation contained a clause that, upon any matters of disagreement, two, three, or more of every of the confederated colonies, should have absolute power to determine the same by a majority vote, this clause was so altered as to provide, that, if the commissioners unanimously agreed, their decision should be binding; but otherwise, they were to seek new instructions, and so proceed until they could agree. These Articles, thus altered, were sent to the General Court at Newtown; but the Court, disliking the alterations, declined accepting them; and the delegates from Connecticut waiving any intention of intermeddling with the settlers in Massachusetts, the Court, thinking Springfield was within its limits, inclined to assume jurisdiction over that place, and inserted an article, so bounding the colonies as to include that plantation. This displeased the Connecticut people; and it being reported that they "went on to exercise authority at Agawam," the Governor wrote them to "forbear until the line was laid out." To this letter a "harsh reply" was returned, declining to "treat further until they heard from the gentlemen at Saybrook," and owing to these miscarriages, the union was not effected.[2] June? 1638.

In the following spring, Mr. Haynes, the Governor of the Hartford Colony, and the Rev. Mr. Hooker, visited Boston to renew the treaty. As a new Governor, Keift, May? 1639.

[1] Hubbard, 309–11; Hazard, 1. 437–41; Trumbull, 1. 190–93, 498–502, ed. 1818.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 342–4.

CHAP. XI.

had been appointed at New Netherland, who was very inquisitive to ascertain "how things stood" between Massachusetts and Connecticut, both were willing to enter into fresh negotiations; and the matter being moved at the General Court, was accepted. There were others, however, interested in these negotiations; and Mr. Fenwick, of Say-
Oct., 1639. brook, who had been written to, says: "If there be anything between you and the towns above about bounds, whatsoever is concluded without us here, I shall account invalid, and must protest against it." This checked further proceedings, nor until 1642, do we again find references to a Confederacy in which Connecticut is distinctly named.[1]

Of the progress of settlement in New Hampshire, we need only remark, that, after the death of Capt. John Mason, the principal proprietary of those parts, the plantations which had been erected were left to shift for themselves, his widow's attorney, Mr. Francis Norton, finding the expense of their maintenance to exceed the profits.[2] Besides the settlements at Dover, Portsmouth, and Exeter,
1636. another was commenced at Winnicumet, or Hampton, where a house, known as the "Bound House," was built, which was intended as a mark of possession rather than of limits with the Massachusetts colony;[3] and, though the agent of Mason's estate objected to these proceedings, it was not until many years after that these objections were seriously of litigiously urged.[4]

The difficulties at Piscataqua, growing out of the misconduct of Burdet, Knollys, Underhill, and others, more properly belong to the history of New Hampshire, and may
1639. therefore be omitted here.[5] Pending these difficulties, the inhabitants of Dover, aware of their own weakness, offered

[1] Winthrop, 1. 360, 368; Hutch. Coll., 107–8.
[2] Belknap's N. H., 1. 39–40.
[3] Hutchinson, 1. 87; Belknap, 1. 38.
[4] Winthrop, 1. 349, 365; Hutch. Coll., 320; Belknap, 1. 38.
[5] Winthrop, 1. 332, 350–2; 2. 32–4; Lechford, in 3. M. H. Coll., 3; Belknap, N. H., vol. 1. chap. 2.

to come under the government of Massachusetts; and answer was returned, that, if they would send commissioners empowered to treat upon the subject, the court would probably agree to their propositions. With this encouragement commissioners were appointed; but, as the articles they brought were disliked, a conditional treaty was concluded, to the effect that "they should be as Ipswich and Salem, and have courts there;" and this was ratified under the seal of Massachusetts, with the understanding that, "if the people did not assent to it, they might be at liberty." "Those of Exeter" sent similar propositions, but "not liking the agreement with those of Dover," they declined proceeding further.[1] CHAP. XI.

The people of Dover and Portsmouth at this time had no power of government delegated from the Crown, but had combined themselves into bodies politic, like their neighbors at Exeter; and in 1640, four distinct governments, including one at Kittery, were formed on the branches of the Piscataqua; but, being all voluntary agreements, liable to be broken or dissolved upon the first popular ferment, there could be no surety of their continuance, and no stability in their management. The distractions in England, which convulsed the whole nation, cut off all hope of the attention of royalty; and the conflicting opinions of the settlements themselves, precluded the formation of a general government which could afford a prospect of permanent utility.[2] Hence the more judicious inclined to incorporate with the Massachusetts Colony; and, as the bounds of the latter Colony extended northward to three miles north of every part of the Merrimac, and these bounds were yet intact, no accurate survey of the country having been made, and if pressed would include the whole of New Hampshire, and a 1640.

[1] Winthrop, 1. 384–5; 2. 32; Mass. Rec's., 1. 276.

[2] Hubbard, 372; Hutchinson, 1. 102; Belknap, 1. 51.

CHAP. XI.

large part of Maine, so that Mason's and Gorges' patents must both have been vacated, the alliance became a matter of paramount importance, and the settlers were generally disposed to enter upon an early treaty for its accomplishment.

Jun. 14, 1641. Accordingly, the "lords and gentlemen," who held the patent at Dover and Strawberry Bank, "finding no means to govern the people there," agreed to assign their interest of jurisdiction, reserving to themselves "the greater part of the proprietary of their lands;" and, commissioners being Oct. 7, 1641. appointed on both sides, the "whole river" became incorporated with the Massachusetts colony. The next year Sept. 8, 1642. Exeter followed their example, and Mr. Wheelwright removed to Wells, in Maine.[1]

Turning now to the Plymouth colony, we find that the bounds between that colony and Massachusetts were long unsettled; and it was regarded as "a plot of the old serpent to sow jealousies and difficulties" about these bounds. The North West line of Scituate was the colony line; and 1633. the court at Plymouth, having granted to four gentlemen, usually called "Merchant Adventurers," a large tract called "the Conihasset Grant," Hingham, which then included Cohasset, claimed part of the marshes on the East side of the "Conihasset Gulph." This claim was resisted; and commissioners were appointed from year to year for the adjustment of the difficulties; but the question remained an open one even after the Confederacy was formed, nor was it until subsequent to the restoration of Charles II., that the line was amicably adjusted.[2]

[1] Mass. Rec's., 1. 324, 332, 342–3; Winthrop, 2. 45, 50–1, 144, 195–8, 259; Hutchinson, 105–6; Belknap, 1. 54–8, &c. For the unfounded charge, that Mass. *forcibly* seized upon N. H., see Belknap, 1., App. xvi, xxi, &c. The sketch of Chalmers, Ann., chap. 17, must be read with caution, as it is, in many respects, partial and one sided, besides being erroneous in several important particulars.

[2] Colonial Papers, vol. 2. fols. 17–23, 432–4, in Mass. Archives; Mass. Rec's., 1. 196, 254, 257, 271; Winthrop, 1. 341, 365; 2, 21; Plym. Col. Rec's.; Deane's Scit., 1–4.

Other questions, however, of greater moment, arose during this period, relating to difficulties at the Eastward. One of these occurred as early as the fall of 1632, when Pemaquid was rifled by pirates, under Bull; but, by the intervention of Massachusetts, and assistance from the East, the pirates were expelled, and went to the Southward.[1] CHAP. XI. Nov. 1632.

Early the next year, intelligence was received that the French, to whom, by the treaty of St. Germains, the right to New France had been resigned, and who had established their settlements to the North of New England, had bought the Scottish settlement of Sir William Alexander, near Cape Sable, and that Cardinal Richelieu had sent companies of settlers, including priests and Jesuits, and that more were to follow. Alarmed by these tidings, a meeting was held at Boston, at which the ministers and captains were invited to be present, to advise what should be done should the French prove "ill-neighbors;" and it was agreed, forthwith to finish the fort at Boston, to erect another at Nantasket, and to commence a plantation at Ipswich, to bar their entrance should they make a descent upon the coast.[2] Jan. 17, 1632-3.

In the fall, La Tour, the governor to the East of the St. Croix, who had procured grants from the King of France, and who was determined to obtain possession of as much of the country as possible, visited Machias, where a trading house had been erected, and, laying claim to the place, two of the residents were killed, and the other three, with goods to the value of £400, or £500, were taken and carried off. Mr. Allerton, of Plymouth, being sent to recover these goods, and to demand of La Tour by what Nov. 1633.

[1] Winthrop, 1. 114–17, 123; Clap, in Chron. Mass., 362–3; Hubbard, 160; 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 232; Williamson's Me., 1. 252.

[2] Winthrop, vol. 1.; Hubbard, 161.

CHAP. XI.

authority the attack had been made, he replied: "I have taken them as my lawful prize; my authority is from the king of France, who claims the coast from Cape Sable to Cape Cod; I wish the English to understand, that if they trade to the eastward of Pemaquid, I shall seize them; my sword is all the commission I shall show; when I want help, I will produce my authority. Take your goods, and be gone."[1]

May 3, 1634. To these difficulties others were added. The Plymouth people had, for some years, possessed a patent of lands at Kennebec, and had erected a trading house for the improvement of their grant; and about this time, one Hocking, or Hoskins, came, in a pinnace belonging to Lord Say and Lord Brook, to interfere with their trade; but two of the magistrates of Plymouth being present, of whom John Alden was one, they forbade his passage. Yet he went up the river, and a collision occurred, in which he killed one of his assailants, and was instantly shot himself in return.

May 14. At the next court at Boston, upon the complaint of a kinsman of Hocking, Mr. Alden was arrested, and bound over with sureties to answer for the alleged murder. Upon this messengers were sent from Plymouth, to confer with the magistrates and ministers of Massachusetts; and meet-

July 9. ing at Boston, after some discussion it was agreed, that the right of Plymouth to regulate the trade at Kennebec was good; yet the death of Hocking was deemed "in some sort a breach of the sixth commandment;" but, as it was partly an act of self-defense, it was on the whole adjudged to be "excusable homicide;" and, after some further negotiations with Capt. Wiggin, of Piscataqua, the affair was amicably settled, and Mr. Alden was discharged.[2]

[1] Winthrop, 1. 117–18, 139, 184; 2. 151–2, 219; Hubbard, 163; Hutchinson, 1. 33, 121; Williamson's Me., 1. 247–50.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 156, 162–3, 166, 174; Mass. Rec's., 1. 119; Hubbard, 167–8; Williamson's Me., 1. 253; N. E. Gen. Reg., 9.

In the following year another affray occurred. A French ship, commanded by D'Aulney, the governer to the West of the St. Croix, under a commission from Razilla, the commandant of the fortress at La Heve, rifled the Plymouth trading house at Penobscot, and bade the men "tell the plantations as far as forty degrees, that they would come the next year with eight ships and displant them all." To avenge this wrong, the Great Hope, Mr. Girling, Master, then at Boston, was hired by the Plymouth people to dislodge the French; and with this vessel, their own bark and twenty men were sent to aid in the attack. But the enemy heard of the enterprise, and were found so strongly entrenched that no impression could be made upon them. Immediately, application was made to Massachusetts for aid. That colony was willing to grant this request, if the Plymouth people would *bear all the expense;* but the latter refused to deal in the matter "otherwise than as a common cause of the whole country," and "all was deferred to further counsel."[1] CHAP. XI. August, 1635.

It was partly in consequence of these French difficulties, that Mr. Winslow was sent to England, to petition the Council for aid to withstand their encroachments; but negotiations were continued by Massachusetts, fearful for her own safety, and in the fall of 1636, a letter was received from D'Aulney, in which he proposed to claim no farther than Pemaquid, until he received further orders.[2] 1634. 1636.

At the death of Razilla, D'Aulney and La Tour, the great rival chiefs at the East, both claimed the command of Acadia, and made war upon each other; and Mons. Rochet being sent to Boston, by La Tour, he propounded "liberty of free commerce," assistance against D'Aulney, and the privilege of returning goods out of England by Nov., 1641.

[1] Winthrop, 1. 198, 200–01; Hubbard, 161–2.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 246.

CHAP. XI.

the merchants of Massachusetts. The first was granted; but, for the want of sufficient credentials on his part, the last two were waived.[1] In the following year, the Lieutenant of La Tour visited Boston, with letters from his master, "full of compliments and desire of assistance against D'Aulney;" and, at his return, several merchants, at their own risk, sent a "pinnace to trade with La Tour at the St. John's." By these, La Tour "sent a relation of the state of the controversy between him and D'Aulney;" and meeting the latter at Pemaquid, he also wrote Governor Winthrop, and "sent him a printed copy of the arrest against La Tour," threatening if any vessels came to his aid, they should be seized.[2]

Sept. 6, 1642.

Thus affairs stood at the date of the Confederacy; after which, La Tour himself landed at Boston, from Rochelle, and requested aid to regain his fort at St. John's, which D'Aulney had taken; and a meeting of the magistrates being called, he produced his commission from the Vice Admiral of France, with other papers confirming his authority. The community was greatly divided in opinion relative to the propriety of aiding him; fears were expressed that "store of blood would be spilled in Boston;" and a discussion ensued, characteristic of the age, and well fortified with passages and precedents from the Old Testament; but eventually, he was permitted to hire four vessels at his own risk, and, taking a few volunteers into his pay, he set sail, being instructed to parley before proceeding to extremeties.[3]

Jun. 12, 1643.

Subsequently, a letter was written to D'Aulney, exculpating the colony, on the ground that neither Christianity nor humanity would permit them to reject the petition of La Tour, and affirming, that the volunteers who aided him

[1] Winthrop, 2. 51.
[2] Winthrop, 2. 51, 106, 109; 499–502. Hutchinson, 1. 122.
[3] Winthrop, 2. 162–3; Hazard, 1.

had no public commission, but engaged on their own responsibility. There was, doubtless, a deep policy in thus playing off these rival chieftains one against the other, to prevent them from invading the colony; but the interference of Massachusetts was unquestionably a violation of the neutrality which should have prevailed, and might have resulted disastrously; for D'Aulney immediately went to France for aid, and was expected to return the next summer with a large force. Fortunately, a messenger was sent by him on his arrival, with proposals of peace; and after some negotiation, a league was effected, and La Tour was left to the management of his own affairs.[1] 1645.

CHAP. XI.

The condition of the colonies at this period, in point of prosperity, is worthy a passing glance. The distresses of the first winter have been already alluded to; and such was the scarcity, with the dearness of provisions in England, that every bushel of wheat meal cost 14s. sterling, and peas were 11s., and beans 16s. per bushel.[2] The emigrants, besides materials for their buildings, tools for their husbandry, and clothing for their families, brought with them neat cattle, sheep, swine, and poultry; but to have lived upon these would have been injurious to their future interests, as upon their increase they were to depend for the supply of coming years. Their principal food, therefore, was Indian corn, which, before mills were erected, was prepared for domestic use by pounding it in mortars of wood or of stone.[3] But the perils of the first winter were the severest they encountered; and, although there were

[1] For more ample details, see Mass. Rec's., vol. 3. pp. 44, 76, et seq.; Winthrop, vol. 2; Hutch. Coll., 113-34; Hazard, 2. 50-4; 3 M. H. Coll., 7. 91-109; Haliburton's Nova Scotia, 1. 51-63; Williamson's Me., 1. 307-24.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 55; Johnson, in 2 M. H. Coll., 7. 36.

[3] Pumpkins were esteemed a great luxury in those days. Says the "New England Ballad,"

"We have pumpkins at morning, and pumpkins at noon,
If it was not for pumpkins, we should be undone."

CHAP. XI.

occasional complaints of injury to their crops, from the backwardness of spring, the heat of summer, and the ravages of worms, industry and good husbandry succeeded in securing bountiful harvests and plentiful supplies. New England, it is true, was not a terrestrial paradise, yielding, like Eden, "every tree pleasant to the sight and good for food;" nor was it destitute of poisonous insects, venemous reptiles, and savage beasts; yet was it far from being a wilderness of rocks, sands, and salt marshes, as its maligners represented it. Its air was salubrious, and its waters were pure; and, notwithstanding the severity of its winters, and the frequency of its storms, with the attendant sufferings, the skies of summer were fair and bright, and the tints of its autumnal scenery unsurpassed anywhere. Its soil lacked the fertility of the alluvions of the West, or the spontaneous exuberance of tropical climes, yet it amply rewarded industrious labor. Fuel was abundant. Fish could be obtained whenever desired. And game, in the season of it, haunted the woods. It was a pleasant abode for cheerfulness and content; and, as a majority of the planters were frugal and moral, all had bread enough to eat and to spare.

1643. Before 1643, there were supposed to be a thousand acres of land planted, for orchards and gardens; fifteen thousand other acres were under general tillage; the number of neat cattle was estimated at twelve thousand; and the number of sheep at three thousand. Many hundred laborers, who "had not enough to bring them over," and who hired themselves out for the payment of their passage, were now worth their scores, and some even hundreds of pounds, carefully invested in lands and stock.[1] Money was scarce; and, by an order of Court, bullets for a time passed for farthings.[2] But, as the productions of the colony increased,

[1] Johnson, in 2 M. H. Coll., 7. [2] Mass. Rec's.. 1. 137; Winthrop, 36; Winthrop, vol. 1, passim. 1. 186.

the surplus, with the furs obtained of the natives, laid the foundation of a lucrative commerce. New buildings, some even of brick, sprung up in every quarter of Boston; markets were erected; wharves stretched into the harbor; native and foreign vessels were sent to the West Indies, and to the Madeira Islands, and returned laden with sugar, oranges, wine, cotton, tobacco, and bullion; and these, with the furs, and the products of the fisheries at the Cape and at the Banks, including morse teeth and oil, procured in trips further to the North, were sent to England to pay for the manufactured goods needed for their wants. The resources of the country were rapidly developed. The vast forests which clothed its surface, were converted into masts, planks, boards, staves, shingles, and hoops, all which were of value in commercial change.[1] Before 1650, 1650. glass works were commenced;[2] and iron foundries were established, at Lynn and Braintree, in the Massachusetts Colony, and at Raynham, in Plymouth.[3] Mills were likewise erected, and ship yards established; and some slight progress was made in the manufacture of linen and cotton cloth.[4] The facilities for domestic manufactures were ample and available. Wool was becoming plenty; flax and hemp could be easily raised; large quantities of hides had been imported; and water privileges were to be found within the limits of nearly every town. But the farmers deemed it more for their profit to exchange cattle and corn for clothing;[5] and, as the yeomanry were the body of the

[1] Danforth, in his Almanack for 1648, has the following rude lines relating to the early commerce of the colony:

"Heaps of wheat, pork, bisket, beef and beer,
Masts, pipe-staves, fish should store both far and near,
Which fetch in wines, cloths, sweets and good tobac —
O be contented then, ye cannot lack."

[2] Mass. Rec's., 2. 137. These works seem to have been begun as early as 1642. Mass. Rec's., 3. 48.

[3] Mass. Rec's., 2. 61, 81, 103, 125, 185; 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 11; Lewis's Lynn, chap. 6, &c.

[4] Mass. Rec's., 1. 103, 294, 303; Winthrop, 2. 144; 3 M. H. Coll., 3. 101.

[5] Johnson, in 2 M. H. Coll., 7. 37.

CHAP. XI.

settlers, the inducements were not sufficient to enter upon extensive investments while the population was limited, and supplies from abroad could be so readily obtained; nor was it until the changes in England checked the flow of emigration from the Old World to the New, causing an immediate and remarkable reduction in the value of cattle, that manufactures assumed an increased importance, and were prosecuted with more vigor.[1]

Nor were the interests of education forgotten or overlooked. Scarcely had the settlers of Massachusetts emerged from the struggles which they encountered upon their arrival in this country, ere their solicitude to secure for their posterity benefits similar to those which themselves had enjoyed in the land of their birth, led to measures for the erection of a seminary, which should enlarge into a College, and eventually into an University, competing with the most famed institutions of the Old World.[2] A large proportion of the clergy of New England, and some of the laity, were men of a liberal education, and were graduates of the time honored Universities of England. The materials of greatness were already theirs, for they brought with them to these shores, in addition to their libraries, minds richly stored with the treasures of learning. But without the perpetuation of this learning, it must die with its possessors. Its diffusion could be secured by instruction alone. Hence, no sooner were churches erected, than school-houses sprung up,

"Fast by the oracles of God."

Learning and religion were united by indissoluble bonds, and intelligence and virtue were the consequent fruit.

Oct. 28, 1636. Six years after the settlement of Boston, and in the autumn of the last of those years, the General Court, with

[1] Winthrop, 2. 21, 26, 37.

[2] New England's First Fruits, ed. 1643, p .9, et seq.

a liberality which for ages will memorize its wisdom, voted the sum of £400, equal to a year's rate of the whole colony, towards the erection of a "public school or college," of which £200 was to be paid the next year, and the balance when the work was finished. The ensuing fall, twelve of the principal magistrates and ministers were chosen, to "take orders for a college at Newtown;" and in the following spring, the name was changed to Cambridge, in honor of the seat of the Alma Mater of so many of the emigrants.[1] CHAP. XI. Nov. 20, 1637. May, 1638.

Before the close of this season, the budding seminary, yet in its infancy, received its first and most munificent bequest, the legacy of John Harvard, a clergyman of Charlestown, and a lover of learning, who died of consumption after a year's residence in the country. One half his whole property, and his entire library, was the amount of this bequest: a sum greater than that appropriated by the Court;[2] and, though larger bequests have since been received, the benefaction was so timely, and the sum so generous, that the name of the legator was at once conferred upon the College, and it still owns him as its principal and earliest founder.[3] Sept.

The "school" which this donation assisted in starting, was at first under the superintendence of Mr. Nathaniel Eaton, who had charge of the funds and buildings, as well as of the pupils; but his scandalous conduct, and the complaint of "short commons," through the parsimony of his wife, soon led to his dismission, and his departure from the Colony.[4] In 1638, the regular course of academic instruc- 1638.

[1] Mass. Rec's., 1. 183, 208, 213, 217, 228; Pierce's Hist.; Quincy's Hist.

[2] Pierce's Hist.,3.—Hubbard, 237, says the amount of the donation was £700.

[3] Mass. Rec's., 1. 253; Quincy's Hist., 9, 10, 586; Everett's Oration; Frothingham's Chas'n., 73–7, &c.

[4] Winthrop.—Hubbard, 247, calls him a "mere Orbilius, fitter to have been an officer in the inquisition, or master of an house of correction, than an instructer of Christian Youth."

CHAP. XI. August, 1642.

tion commenced; and four years after, degrees were conferred upon nine young gentlemen.[1] The "theses" of this first class of graduates have been preserved; and, although the college was conducted as a Theological institution, in strict accordance with the political constitution of the colony, questions in Philology and Philosophy alone were discussed.[2] At this date, a Charter for the College had been granted, and a Board of Overseers established; and the seminary itself was under the charge of President Dunster, a man of eminent talents and singular worth, who, though differing in sentiment from many of his cotemporaries, continued at its head for a period of nearly fourteen years, discharging with fidelity the duties of his office. The institution thus started, was fostered by all favorable to its interests, and the clergy and the laity vied with each other in contributing to its funds. The Commissioners of the United Colonies lent to it their influence; liberal patronage was received from abroad; and before the grant of the Province Charter, in 1692, the office of President had been held by a succession of distinguished men; a large number of students had graduated from its halls; and the institution itself had materially contributed to the prosperity of the colony, and to the promotion of its highest and most permanent interests.[3]

The grammar school at Cambridge, established at a very early period, and nearly coeval with the settlement of that town, under the charge of famed "Master Corlet," taught the preparatory branches, a certain degree of acquaintance with which was necessary for admission to the college; Watertown, Charlestown, Boston, Roxbury, Dorchester, and other towns, from their humble temples of learning, contributed their quota of scholars; from the colony of

[1] For their names, see the Catalogues, and comp. Hutchinson, 1. 444.

[2] For these theses, see Hutchinson, 1. 444.

[3] See the admirable Histories of Pierce and Quincy.

Plymouth came the most promising of her youth to drink at the Pierian spring; distant Connecticut sent of her sons thither; ministers received students into their families, and fitted them for "freshmen;" and everywhere, the seminary was regarded with favor; its instruction was of "the best;" and its support was as liberal as the circumstances of the times permitted or warranted. CHAP. XI 1639 to 1643.

The "village schools" of this period, varied in efficiency according to the sums appropriated for their support, and the competency of the persons employed as instructors. Both in Massachusetts and in the Plymouth Colony, schools were supported by law, and great care was taken that the benefits of education should be enjoyed by all.[1] Instances of neglect were exceedingly rare. Poverty prevented many from giving their children the highest advantages; but comparatively few could be found whose instruction had been wholly overlooked. The literary attainments of the age, it is true, were not extensive; yet there was no idle waste of superfluous energy here. A preparation for the duties of practical life was sought by the most; the ambition of some soared higher; and there were those who could be satisfied only with copious draughts from an inexhaustible fountain.

Pleasing, indeed, was the aspect of things in those days of patriarchal simplicity and freshness, which some have enthusiastically termed the golden age of the colony;[2] — an age when, though elsewhere

> "Thankless thousands were oppressed and clogged
> By ease and leisure, by the very wealth
> And pride of opportunity made poor;
> And tens of thousands faltered in their path,
> And sank through utter want of cheering light;
> For them, the hours of labor did not flag;
> For them, each evening had its shining star,
> And every Sabbath day its golden sun."

[1] Mass. Rec's., 2. 203, and Laws, ed. 1672, pp. 136–7; Plym. Col. Laws, ed. 1671, p. 39.

[2] Hubbard, 247.

CHAP. XI. 1639 to 1643.

Yet were there not wanting a few restless minds; a few who sought for fairer climes and richer fields. And there were others abroad to foster this spirit, and to flatter the hopes of those who desponded. Some, who had been benefactors of the colony, were projecting new settlements in the region of the tropics, and among the Bahamas. Lord Say and Seal was the prominent patron of this enterprise; and Mr. Humphrey, one of the Assistants, was persuaded to enlist in the design, by proffers of high offices, which are tempting to ambitious minds. A plan of government was formed, supremely aristocratical, with hereditary magistrates, and orders of nobility; but as this was repugnant to the republicanism of the Puritans, it was subsequently changed, and assimilated more to that of Massachusetts. Mr. Winthrop, the Governor of Massachusetts, was not very friendly to this scheme. New England was his chosen home, endeared to him by his sacrifices and labors on its behalf. And it grieved him to think there were any, who would withdraw from it their support and encouragement, or transfer their affections to another and more dangerous clime.[1] The principal town of the new colony was called Providence; thither a large number of families were sent; and favorable reports were spread of the ease and plenty which they were bountifully enjoying; but ere long, this "thriving town" was "taken by the Spaniards, and the lords lost all their care and cost, to the value of above £60,000."[2]

This disaster checked further emigration; and, though many returned to England to participate in the stirring events which were there transpiring, the majority of the colonists contentedly remained, and applied themselves with fresh ardor to the upbuilding of their commonwealth, and to those schemes of industry which prom

[1] Winthrop, 2. 104–5.

[2] Winthrop, 1. 399, 401; 2. 15–16, 31, 39, 40; Hubbard, 376–9.

ised to be of permanent utility and value. How eventful had been their history from the period of their landing on these shores! Less than a quarter of a century had elapsed from the settlement of Plymouth, and but little more than half that number of years from the settlement of Boston. Connecticut was in its infancy, its eldest colony being but eight years old, and its youngest but five. With some of the savage tribes which besprinkled the country, they had engaged in a deadly and exterminating strife; and the friendship of the rest was fickle and inconstant. Plots for their overthrow, and rumors of hostilities, were daily maturing and reaching their ears. Our fathers felt painfully their insecurity and danger, and that they rested upon the verge of a slumbering volcano, whose streams of desolation might at any time overleap the feeble barriers which restrained them, and pour a desolating tide of lava over the country. Nor was their situation much better with respect to the French and the Dutch. At the East and at the West, their enemies were subtle, and would rejoice at their downfall. CHAP. XI. 1620 to 1643.

The settlers of New England were comparatively but a handful. But the race is not always to the swift, nor the battle to the strong. Encompassed by dangers, and conscious of their weakness, what more natural, in the hour of peril, distant as they were from the land of their birth, and dependent upon God and their own right hands for their preservation and support, than that they should seek to weave a four-fold cord, not easily broken: — to combine in a Confederacy for mutual aid? Charters were nothing to the instincts of nature. Life was at stake; and what were parchments to those who had homes and families to protect? They did not, therefore, stop to ask permission to act from abroad. If sought, it might have been refused: — and what was to become, in the meantime, of all who were dear to them? Should they be left to the contin-

CHAP. XI. 1639 to 1643.

gencies of chance, when the power was in their own hands to succor and preserve them?

And what was the amount of their debt to the mother country? They had a charter: but it was paid for. They had governments: and little thanks to those who would have prevented it if they could! Little thanks to the enemies who sought to curtail their privileges, and deprive them of their rights. The conduct of Charles shows with what feelings he regarded the exiles. What battles had he fought for them? What aid had he furnished, to deliver them from their enemies? His acts towards the colonies had been eminently aggressive, oppressive, and ruinous:—for can we otherwise characterize his Orders in Council?—his restrictions upon emigration?—his attempts to destroy even the feeble tenure of the charter? What, I again ask, had England done for the colonies? Not even had she treated them with "contemptuous neglect," as has been asserted. All that had been achieved, had been achieved in despite of the opposition of foes. And if credit is anywhere due, it is due to the resolute men, who braved all dangers, encountered all risks, and laid the foundations of their infant commonwealth upon the ruin of their personal fortunes and estates. It is due the stout-hearted and God-fearing men, who brought with them their wives, fit helpmeets for spirits so earnest and daring; their little ones, the pledges of youthful affection; and here, in a wilderness, amidst unsubdued forests, and beasts of prey, and barbarous men; wresting from the soil by arduous labor the means of subsistence; rearing their altars, and worshipping God, devoutly and prayerfully, amidst hardships and neglect; ungenerously oppressed by the Prince who should have encouraged them:—if credit is any where due, it is due to the Pilgrims,—it is due to the Puritans!

Those who look at the history of New England with even the honest persuasion that Episcopacy is a divine

institution, and that, where there is an established religion and an hereditary monarchy the greatest freedom compatible with the interests of man is enjoyed, may see little in our annals to attract attention or excite admiration. But those who read it as an epic of freedom, yearning for liberty, and struggling to secure it; outgrowing the bigotry of its youth, and amply atoning for it by the tolerance of its manhood; where may be beheld, not a statue of marble, destitute of Promethean fire, cold and impassioned, but a glowing, and conscious, and animated form, with its motto, Excelsior, and in the short space of two centuries outstripping the proudest monarchies of the Old World;—those who thus read the history of New England, will find it a history worthy their perusal; showing what can be done, under the influence of religion, intelligence, patriotism, and zeal.

CHAP. XI. 1639 to 1643.

We have portrayed the circumstances which preceded and made necessary that organized union,—the Confederacy of the Colonies. True to their principles, it was, with our fathers, a league for religion as well as for protection. None were to be admitted to it but those of their own faith, sympathizing with their views, and subscribing to their creed. Heretic Providence was debarred from its privileges:—not that Roger Williams would have been left to suffer, nor would he have been refused assistance in the hour of danger; but he had voluntarily withdrawn from the house of the faithful, and how could there be fellowship, unless he repented? The colony at Portsmouth, too, must likewise repent of its sins, or come under the jurisdiction of Plymouth, to be received into communion. And as for Gorton and his followers, they were reprobates of the worst stamp, in the estimation of the churches of the day. The rejection of these was regarded as a probation, designed to give them space for repentance; then would they have been welcomed to the privileges of the

1643.

CHAP. XI. 1643.

union. If there was a spirit of rivalry in the colonies, where has there not been in all human history? If there were personal ends to be answered, where have not human actions been more or less tainted with the spirit of selfishness? Instead, then, of condemning the colonists for what they left undone, let us see what they sought, and what they accomplished by this Confederated Union.

The Preamble to the Articles of Confederation, is a statement of the motives which prompted its formation:—"We all came into these parts of America with one and the same end and aim, viz: to advance the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to enjoy the liberties of the gospel in purity with peace: and whereas, by our settling, by the wise providence of God, we are further dispersed upon the seacoast and rivers than was at first intended, so that we cannot, according to our desire, with convenience communicate in one government and jurisdiction; and whereas we live encompassed with people of several nations and strange languages, which hereafter may prove injurious to us or our posterity; and forasmuch as the natives have formerly committed sundry insolences and outrages upon several plantations of the English, and have of late combined themselves against us, and seeing by reason of the sad distractions in England, (which they have heard of,) and by which they know we are hindered both from that humble way of seeking advice, and reaping those comfortable fruits of protection, which at other times we might well expect; we therefore do conceive it our bounden duty, without delay, to enter into a present consociation among ourselves, for mutual help and strength in all future concernment, that, as in nation and religion, so in other respects, we be and continue one, according to the true tenor and meaning of the ensuing articles."

These Articles are twelve in number. The first fixes the name: "The United Colonies of New England." The

second is a declaration of a firm and perpetual league of friendship, offensive and defensive, for preserving and propagating the truth and liberties of the gospel, and for their own mutual safety and welfare. The third is an assertion of the right of jurisdiction of each colony within its own limits, and confines the Confederacy to the four colonies forming it, unless otherwise agreed. The fourth states the rule to be followed in the apportionment of expenses upon the colonies, for the maintenance of war, by an assessment upon all males between the ages of sixteen and sixty. The fifth prescribes the course to be pursued by each colony in case of an invasion of its territory, to secure the aid of the rest; and the quotas of men to be sent to their relief. The sixth gives to each colony power to elect two commissioners, fully authorized to act in its behalf; six of the eight agreeing upon any measure, the same to be binding; otherwise, the propositions to be referred to the courts of the colonies, and concluded by their consent. The meetings to be held annually and alternately in the colonies on the first Thursday in September. The seventh provides for the election of a president of the board. The eighth provides for the passage of general orders, and the rendition of fugitive servants and criminals. The ninth debars either colony from engaging in war, unless compelled to, without the consent of the rest. The tenth provides for calling extraordinary meetings. The eleventh proffers redress for grievances in the breach of these articles. And the twelfth is a ratification and confirmation of the whole. These measures were initiated May 19, 1643, and ratified on the 7th of the following September.[1]

Such was the New England Confederacy of 1643, the model and prototype of the North American Confederacy of 1774. That it was an assumption of sovereignty, is too

[1] Winthrop, 2. 119–27; Morton's Hazard, vol. 2; Plym. Col. Laws, Mem., 120; Hubbard, 467–74; 308–14.

CHAP. XI. 1643.

obvious to be denied; but it was the sovereignty of the people, where all true power resides. The Charter of Massachusetts foresaw no such union. It was the product of circumstances equally beyond the prescience and the control of the King. To have prohibited it, would have been a detriment to the interests of the colonies. The credit of its accomplishment belongs to its framers; and the importance of its results vindicates its wisdom. Majesty itself could not have legislated better for them. But Majesty was then prostrate, and the people were in power. There was no King to ask permission to act. Parliament had enough to do to maintain its own supremacy. The colonies, three thousand miles distant from England, leagued together for mutual defense; and their Amphyctionic Council was as valuable and as important to them, as the greater Confederacies of the Old World, which the most loyal historians have applauded and approved.

CHAPTER XII.

MASSACHUSETTS AND THE COMMONWEALTH.

For three years previous to, and for seventeen years following the Confederacy of 1643, the theatre of exciting events was transferred, in a great measure, from the New World to the Old; yet these events exerted a powerful influence upon the fortunes of New England, strengthening and developing that deep love of freedom which constitutes the charm of our national history. The price of liberty is said to be eternal vigilance; this liberty had been tasted here; and the boon was too precious to be cast lightly aside. It is no disparagement to our ancestors, it is rather to their honor, that they earnestly sought to secure this blessing, and to transmit it as an invaluable inheritance to their posterity. Freedom is the inalienable birthright of man. Dear is it to all, for it is God's gracious gift. And especially when based upon the gospel of Christ, when it breathes the air of spiritual life, and guides the soul onward to everything noble, is it the proudest and most elevating prerogative of our race. Such was the character of freedom in New England. Progressively unfolding with the advancement of truth, it encountered at first the usual obstacles. It partook of the infirmities incident to humanity. It was blended with harshness, bigotry and intolerance. But the spirit was there, vital and animating; and despite of these obstacles, it moved steadily on, enlarging with the expansion of thought and of feeling, rebuking the violence of turbulent passions, and inciting to deeds of eminent worth.

CHAP. XII.

Liberty in England existed but in name; and to its revival, that nation is largely indebted to the efforts of the Puritans. It has long been the fashion to deride this sect, and to brand it as an embodiment of cant and hypocrisy. Few have comprehended the importance of its mission; fewer have awarded it its just meed of praise. It is so easy to misjudge; it is so easy to join in the sneer against principles which are despised and contemned, that the spirit which animated the body of the Puritans has been undervalued, and lost sight of, by those whose prejudices incline them to speak lightly of every thing not according with their own views and opinions. Hence, even in our own day, Doctors of "the Church" have entered the lists to shiver a lance in the crusade against "Puritanism," and grave Tory Judges have sullied the purity of the ermine of justice, by repeating stale slanders, and retailing their wares as genuine and new. *Magnum contumeliæ remedium, negligentia.*

The revolution in England, which hurled from his throne and sent to the scaffold Charles the First and his wretched advisers, was an event which might have been prophesied years before it transpired. The monarch who tramples upon the necks of his subjects must expect retribution, unless the spirit of freedom is crushed out and annihilated. Tyranny weaves the web of its own destiny, and, when caught in the meshes, it struggles in vain to escape from its prison. Such was the experience of the ill-fated Charles; and those who had suffered the most from his cruelty, were the instruments to accomplish his ruin and death.

1629-40. From the dissolution of the Parliament of 1629, to the assembling of the Long Parliament, in 1640, the nation was ruled, in civil affairs, by the tyranny of Charles and his Ministers of State, and in ecclesiastical affairs, by the tyranny of Laud and the prelates of the Church. This twofold despotism arrayed against the government nearly all

the respectable portion of the nobility, the numerous body of the Presbyterians, and the by no means insignificant party of the Puritans. The nobility, however, by birth and by station, were the advocates of royalty, and the friends of conservatism. The Presbyterians were favorable to a limited monarchy, if complaisant to their creed. The Puritans alone were the harbingers of republicanism. The three parties combined, proved a powerful opposition, which commenced a series of important reforms, broke up the High Commission Court, abolished the Star Chamber, sent Laud to the Tower, Strafford to the scaffold, and Finch into exile. But when these ends were attained, the nobility were satisfied; and, fearing that innovation, if pushed too far, might terminate in anarchy, they inclined to retrace their steps, and to compromise with the King, listening too favorably to his protestations of fidelity to the interests of his subjects. The Presbyterians and Puritans were earnest to continue the work which had been begun, and to rectify abuses which had long been a subject of grievance and complaint. Contending for equality against privilege, and for freedom against prerogative, the assumptions of royalty they were determined to restrain; the liberties of the people they were anxious to enlarge; the corruptions of the church they were resolved to remove; and, resenting an act of the grossest injustice, an invasion of the rights and privileges of Parliament, the Monarch became a fugitive and an exile from London. CHAP. XII. Jan. 4, 1641-2.

The leaders in the Puritan ranks were no hair-brained fanatics: they were experienced statesmen and skilful politicians: and worthily have they been cognominated "The Statesmen of the Commonwealth." Pym, Hampden, Vane and Sydney, are names of which England has as much reason to be proud, as of the worthies of the revolution of 1688; and, though the contest which they waged failed, because too much was attempted, these men, notwithstand-

CHAP. XII.

ing their errors, will ever be acknowledged, by the candid and discerning, as friends of their country and champions of its liberties.

Aug 21, 1642. It was in 1642, that the sword was unsheathed, and the King and the Parliament were in battle array. The latter, for a season, struggled against difficulties, lacking disciplined troops; but when Cromwell enlisted, and his extra-

1644. ordinary genius was bent to remodel the army, a change was soon visible: the Ironsides were invincible: Charles was made prisoner: Parliament was purged: the Presbyterians were routed: the Puritans gained the ascendency: their chief became the arbiter of the destinies of the na-

1649-50. tion: the Monarch was beheaded: and England was decreed a Commonwealth. But revolution stopped not here. The victorious troops were turned againt the Commonwealth, still loyal to liberty; and Cromwell, by a fatal mistake, pushed rashly on his schemes of personal aggrandizement, until he was declared Lord Protector, and pompously

May 12, 1657. enthroned as the head of the State. In a twelvemonth more he was numbered with the dead. Richard, his son, was subdued by faction. Mark shared the same fate. And

1660. in 1660, royalty was restored; the gay Charles the Second ascended the throne; and, as the key to his reign, the first night of his return to London was signalized by the seduction of a beautiful woman of nineteen, the wife of one of his subjects!

These events, whilst transpiring, were regarded by all nations with wonder and amazement; but in New England the struggle was deemed a struggle for religion. The news was not long in reaching these shores; and when it was

Dec., 1640. reported that the Scots had entered England; that a parliament had been called; and that there was hope of a thorough reform; some "began to think of returning back to England, and others, despairing of further help from thence, turned their minds wholly to a removal to the

south."[1] Mr. Cradock, the first Governor of the Massachusetts Company, was a member of the Long Parliament from the city of London. Sir Henry Vane, Lord Say and Seal, the Earl of Warwick, John Hampden, and Oliver Cromwell, all friends of America, also held seats in that memorable body. And it was probably from some of these that letters were received, advising that persons should be sent to solicit for the colonies, and giving hope that their requests would be favorably entertained. But too prudent were the statesmen of New England to subject themselves voluntarily to external control. "If we put ourselves under their protection," they argued, "we must be subject to their laws, in which, though they may intend our good, it may be prejudicial to us." Hence the flattering invitation was respectfully declined, though agents were sent — Mr. Hibbins, Mr. Welde, and Mr. Peter — to "mediate ease in customs and excise," and to obtain supplies for the benefit of learning.[2]

CHAP. XII.

Mar. 16, 1640-1.

Aug. 3, 1641.

Shortly after, by visitors in England, a petition was preferred "for redress of that restraint which had been put upon ships and passengers;" and an order was passed, "that the colonies should enjoy all their liberties according to their patent:" — "whereby," adds Winthrop, "our patent, which had been condemned, and called in upon an erroneous judgment, in a quo warranto, was implicitly revived and confirmed."[3]

At the end of a year, Mr. Hibbins, one of the agents,

Sep., 1642.

[1] Winthrop, vol. 2.

[2] Mass. Rec's., 1. 332; Winthrop, 2. 30, 37–8; Hubbard, 371; N. E. Gen. Reg., 5. 235–6. The assertions of Chalmers, Ann., 172, and Revolt, 1. 84, we shall not stop to refute. In the Library of Harvard College, is a volume of MS. Letters, &c., relating to the mission of Welde in England, the funds collected by him for a common stock, the use of the poor, the transportation of poor children, the use of the College, the advancement of learning, the enlargement of the Library, and the conversion of the Indians, with the disposition of these funds, and a personal vindication from certain false charges, &c. See also Colonial papers, Mass. Archives, vol. 2. fol. 5.

[3] Winthrop, 2. 50.

CHAP. XII.

returned, bearing letters from "divers Lords of the Upper House, and some thirty of the House of Commons, and others from the ministers which stood for the independency of the churches," to Cotton, and Hooker, and Davenport, the three lights in the ecclesiastical firmament of the colonies, inviting them to sit as members of that body, known the world over as the "Westminister Assembly." Cotton and Davenport inclined to accept this invitation; but Hooker, who was himself engaged in devising a scheme of polity for the churches of New England, "liked not the business;" and, upon the receipt of other letters, informing them of the breach between the King and the Parliament, and advising delay, the design was relinquished.[1]

We have elsewhere remarked that the Colony of Virginia was chiefly founded by members of the Episcopal Church. There were, however, a few, at "the upper new farms," who were Puritans; and from these, now that there was a prospect of a change in affairs abroad, letters were received, earnestly entreating a supply of ministers, "whom, upon experience of their gifts and godliness they might call to office." This request was granted, and three clergymen, Knowles, of Watertown, Thompson, of Braintree, and James, of New Haven, were sent, with letters of recommendation to Sir William Berkley, the Governor, to propagate Puritanism in the "Old Dominion." Entering immediately upon the duties of their office, the people gave them "loving and liberal entertainment," and the prospect seemed favorable of succeeding in their mission. But Governor Berkley had little sympathy with the religious or political principles of the propagandists; and, so far was he from patronizing or protecting them in their work, that a previous law of the colony was applied to them, "for the preservation of purity and unity of doc-

Oct. 7, 1643.

[1] Winthrop, 2. 92; Hubbard, 409; Hutchinson, 1. 111–12; 1 M. H. Coll, 9. 45.

trine and discipline in the Church," which empowered the Governor and Council to compel all, who could not produce testimonials of ordination from some bishop in England, or who would not conform to the ritual and discipline of the Established Church, to depart immediately from the limits of the jurisdiction.[1]

But if Virginia had no sympathy with the Puritans, Parliament, which was more powerful, contained many friends to their views; and, aware of the disadvantages under which the colonies had labored during the reign of Charles the First, an Order for their encouragement was passed, granting an exemption from taxes on exports and imports for a limited term.[2] This Order was recorded, in token of gratitude;[3] but it was soon followed by another, of a less welcome character, which appointed Robert, Earl of Warwick, Governor in Chief, and Lord High Admiral of all the Islands and Plantations in America, with five peers and twelve commoners as his council or assistants; and empowered them to call in, as advisers, any of the planters within twenty miles of the places for holding their meetings; to examine all records relating to the colonies; to appoint or remove governors and other officers at their discretion; and to assign such portion of their powers as they saw fit, to residents of the colonies or others, to be exercised in trust. It is probable that this commission was principally designed to apply to the West Indies; but, as its terms included all the colonies, all were under its control, and protections and patents were granted, and sub-commissions issued for the furtherance of its objects.[4]

Mar. 19, 1642-3.

1643.

[1] Mass. Rec's., 2. 27; Winthrop, 2. 93-4, 115-16, 198-9; Cotton's Way, 76-7; Hubbard, 410-11; Johnson, in 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 29-32; Chalmers, Ann., 121, and Revolt, 1. 85; Henning, 1. 277, Act. 64; Trott's, Laws, Art. Va.; Holmes, 1. 271, &c.

[2] Maritime Papers, vol. 1. fol. 23, Mass. Ar.; Winthrop, 2. 118, 289; Hubbard; Hutchinson, 1. 110-11; Chalmers, Ann., 175-6, and Revolt, 1. 90; Hazard, 1. 494; Anderson, Hist. Commerce, 2. 404-5.

[3] Mass. Rec's., 2. 34; Hazard, 1. 496.

[4] Hazard, 1. 533.

CHAP. XII.

March, 1644. Of one of these sub-commissions, Massachusetts was destined to experience the inconvenience. This was granted to Capt. Stagg, authorizing him to take all vessels, inward or outward bound, from Bristol, Barnstable, and Dartmouth, in hostility against the King and Parliament, and to visit all ships, in any port or creek, seizing and confiscating those which refused peaceably to submit. In the harbor between Boston and Charlestown, there lay a small Bristol

Jun. 23. ship, laden with fish for Bilboa; and this vessel was visited by Capt. Stagg, who produced his commission, and demanded its surrender within half an hour. The news of this act spread like wild-fire through the town, and before the half-hour expired, Windmill, now Copp's Hill, was thronged with spectators to see the issue, among whom were some interested in the ship, especially a Bristol merchant, who "began to gather a company, and to raise a tumult," for which he was arrested, and committed until the excitement was over.[1]

As there was to be a Court soon at Salem, thither Capt. Stagg was cited to appear; but the ministers, thoroughly aroused, began publicly from their pulpits to condemn his proceedings, and to exhort the magistrates to "maintain the liberties of the people," which were violated by this act. Some were in favor of forcing the commissioner to restore the ship; but the majority being of a different judgment, he was permitted to retain it.

The grounds taken in this discussion are worthy of notice. "This," said they, "can be no precedent to bar us from opposing any commission truly dangerous to our liberties; for it is the motto of the present powers, that *salus populi* is *suprema lex*. It will be unwise to oppose Parliament while the King and the European States are hostile, as thereby we shall be left open as a prey to all men. The power of Parliament lawfully extends to pe-

[1] Maritime Papers, vol. 1. fols. 140–1; Mass. Rec's., 3. 31.

culiar and privileged places, where the King's writs would be of no force, as in the Duchy of Lancaster, the Cinque Ports, and in London itself. We have openly declared our affection to the cause of reform in England, and to rise up in opposition now, will afford a pretext to those of Virginia and the West Indies to confirm them in their rebellious course, and will grieve our friends. If goods are unlawfully seized, order will without doubt be taken for their restoration. And finally, should parliament itself hereafter be of a malignant spirit, and the *colonies strong enough, salus populi may then be made use of to withstand any authority from thence to our hurt.*"

On the other hand, it was said: "Massachusetts is even now a *perfecta respublica*, not subject to appeal, nor to the control of any power exterior to itself." But to this it was replied, that, "though the patent freed them from appeals in cases of judicature, it did not free them in point of state, for the King could not create a republic in such sense, nor had he absolute power without Parliament."[1]

Already had the colonists become a race of politicians, and discussions of abstract questions of government, having their foundation in elemental as well as in actual truth, were common in the community. As in the army of Xenophon, so in Massachusetts, boundless liberty of speech was indulged; and the magistrates and the clergy, the civil and spiritual Xenophons, were as earnest as any. Political discourses were frequently delivered; and at every annual Court, one of the ministers was appointed to preach an "Election Sermon." The power of the clergy was every where felt, and seldom was any affair of importance undertaken without their advice. Yet their decisions were not blindly followed. They were scanned by the people, dis-

[1] Winthrop, 2. 222–5 Hubbard, 474–7; Mass. Rec's.. 2. 79, 82, 113, 121.

CHAP. XII.

cussed by the magistrates, revised by the delegates, and only adopted so far as they were regarded as sound and judicious.[1] One or two instances illustrating this statement, will afford an insight into the temper of the times.

Mr. Nathaniel Ward, of Ipswich, the framer of the "Body of Liberties," and the author of that singular work, the "Simple Cobler of Agawam," a republican of great energy, and fearless in the expression of his opinions,
1641. delivered a sermon, "grounding his propositions upon the old Roman and Grecian governments," and advising the people to "keep all their magistrates in an equal rank." He also opposed the practice, then common, of giving private advice in suits at law. "But," said the magistrates, with no little warmth, "are we to be tied down to old Roman and Grecian precedents? If God makes men wiser than their neighbors, and if these times have the advantage of former times, in experience and observation, can we not, by these helps, frame better than heathen laws? Besides, to make all magistrates equal, is against the practice of Israel, where some were rulers of thousands, and some of but tens. And if magistrates may not give private advice, we must have lawyers to plead in our courts; and of this dreaded fraternity we are now happily clear. If magistrates may not grant original processes, for what purpose are they entrusted with power? By noticing cases before they are brought to court, difficulties may be often ended without charge or trouble. Such pre-knowledge, also, saves time in arguing cases. It is allowed in criminal, and why not in civil suits? If it is objected, that the magistrates are in danger of being prejudiced, if the thing itself is good, it should not be rejected because of the temptations incident to it, for in the least duties men are exposed to great temptations."[2]

[1] Cotton's Way, 67, and the Pref. to that rare work of John Norton, in reply to Pynchon.

[2] Winthrop, 2. 42–3.

Upon another occasion, Mr. Ezekiel Rogers, of Rowley, preached, described the qualifications of a chief magistrate, and sought to dissuade the people from choosing the same person twice in succession: but his discourse did not prevent the re-election of the former incumbents.[1] CHAP. XII. May 10, 1643.

The most exciting discussions, however, were between the magistrates and the deputies. One of these related to the appointment of the Court preachers. At first, such appointments were made by the assistants; but when the house of deputies was established, they claimed the appointing power.[2] It was by the freemen that Mr. Ward was chosen, in 1641, and Mr. Rogers, in 1643. These, therefore, represented the democracy of the country, as the preachers chosen by the assistants represented the aristocracy. In 1645, the contest was brought to an issue. At the preceding October Court, Mr. Norton, of Ipswich, was chosen by the deputies to preach at the next election; but two months before the election, the magistrates met, and chose Mr. Norris, of Salem. Here were two chosen: which should officiate? It was put to the vote, and the deputies triumphed. The choice fell upon Mr. Norton, and Mr. Norris was rejected. The magistrates were chagrined at this defeat, and expressed their fears that, by submitting to such decisions, countenance would be given to unjust usurpations. "Out of court," said they, "the deputies have no power. The magistrates are the standing council, and they alone are authorized to act at such times."[3] 1645. Oct., 1644.

Yet even of the magistrates, there were some of a different opinion; and one of these, Mr. Richard Saltonstall, published a book against the standing council, as a "sinful 1642.

[1] Winthrop, 2. 119.

[2] From Mass. Rec's., 3. 80, it would seem that in 1646, if not earlier, the preachers were selected by the Assistants and Deputies alternately.

[3] Winthrop, 2. 268.

CHAP. XII.

innovation." The Governor and others inclined to censure this work, as containing "offensive and unwarrantable" passages, and proposed to submit to the clergy the "soundness of the propositions and arguments." This the court would not allow, unless the whole case was referred; and the author was discharged uncensured.[1]

Such differences could not long exist without leading to important results; and, as the charter government was highly aristocratical, and the people were in favor of "larger liberties," there was a jealousy of the power of the magistrates, and a strenuous attempt to limit this power. A commission was drawn up by the deputies, authorizing seven of the magistrates, and three of the deputies, with Mr. Ward, of Ipswich, to "order all affairs of the Commonwealth in the vacancy of the general court." This proposition was repelled as dangerous, tending to subvert the foundations of the government; and the deputies were desired to "consider of a way how this danger might be avoided and the liberties of the freemen preserved inviolable." A conference was held. The exceptions of the magistrates were, that the creation of general officers was reserved to the courts of election; that four of the magistrates were omitted in the commission; and that the commission itself was contrary to the patent. In reply, precedents were urged, in the appointment of councils of war, and other similar departures from the charter; and it was contended, that the assistants had no power but what was given them by the court. The magistrates denied the validity of these precedents, and urged, that the patent had been varied from only in non-essentials; and that the fact of the election of governor and assistants implied authority to govern at all times, otherwise, in the vacancy of the courts, there was no power to order, dispose, or punish, in cases where there was no positive law.

June 5, 1644.

[1] Mass. Rec's., 2. 5, 20–1; Winthrop, 2. 77–8, 107–09; Hubbard, 385–9.

CHAP. XII.

As a compromise, a new commission was introduced, relating to cases of war only, and including all the magistrates; but the question of its adoption was referred to the next Court, when the whole controversy was decided with the assistance of the elders. The magistrates were conceded to be, both by patent and election, the standing council in the vacancy of the courts, with power to act in all cases according to law. Legislative and consultative powers were conceded to belong to the freemen with the magistrates; but judicial powers were vested solely in the magistrates, except in cases of removal or appeal, in the decision of which the freemen were entitled to act.[1] Thus ended the struggle for a season; and the discussion shows the jealousy of the people to guard against arbitrary power. Yet, notwithstanding "these differences, they continued in brotherly love, and in the exercise of friendly offices to each other, as occasion required."

Oct. 30, 1644.

We have remarked that the appointment of a Governor-general was not particularly acceptable to Massachusetts. But the dissatisfaction of the people did not prevent a suitable acknowledgment of allegiance to England; and, by an Order of Court, it was decreed, that "whosoever should, by word, writing, or action, endeavor to disturb the public peace, directly or indirectly, by drawing a party, under the pretense that he was for the King of England, and such as joined with him against the Parliament, should be accounted an offender of a high nature against the Commonwealth, to be proceeded with, either capitally or otherwise, according to the quality or degree of his offense." It was wisely provided, however, that this should not "extend against any merchants, strangers, and shipmen, that come hither merely for trade and merchandise, albeit they should come from any of those parts that are in the hands

May 29, 1644.

[1] Mass. Rec's., 2. 90–6; 3. 11, 2. 204–8, 228, 250–7; Hutch. Coll., under date May 14, 1645; Winthrop, 179–88; Hubbard, 392–401.

CHAP. XII. of the King; and such as adhere to them against the Parliament, carrying themselves quietly and free from raising or nourishing any faction, mutiny, or sedition," &c.[2]

The situation of the contending parties in England, exposed vessels to capture, both by Parliament and by the King; and, as the latter made no distinction between colonial and national vessels, the commerce of the colonies suffered some checks. Hence several merchants of Boston, whose ship had been seized on the coast of Wales, demanded redress by the seizure of a Dartmouth ship then in the har-

Sep. 19, 1646. bor; and an order was sent for her surrender. With this order her commander complied "the more willingly, for that some London ships of greater force, also riding in the harbor, had threatened to take him." The next morning Capt. Richardson, under pretense of a commission from the Lord Admiral, "fitted his ship to take her;" but the magistrates interfered, and an officer was sent to prevent his proceeding. Resistance being shown, a warning gun was fired from the fort, which "cut a rope in the head of his ship," and one of his crew went below to return the fire. Another gun was discharged from the battery, but without harm; and forty men being sent to take possession of the Dartmouth ship, Capt. Richardson came on shore, acknowledged his error, and was released on paying a barrel of powder, and satisfying the officers and soldiers whom he had made it necessary to employ. It was the firm intention of the magistrates to have sunk his vessel, had he not yielded; but his submission prevented the effusion of blood, and he was forbidden to intermeddle with any ship in the harbor, his commission "not being under the great seal, nor grounded upon any ordinance of Parliament." Subse-

Nov. 13. quently, to secure neutrality, a commission was appointed, consisting of Major Edward Gibbons, and Major Robert

[2] Mass. Rec's., 2. 69; Hutchinson, 1. 128; Chalmers, Ann., 175; Hazard, 1. 526.

Sedgewick, "to keep the peace, and not to permit any ships to fight in the harbor without license from authority."[1] Yet all ships from any of the ports of England or elsewhere, coming peaceably, were to have free access to the harbors, and protection, by paying the duties and charges required by the government.[2]

April, 1645. The year previous to this, by the advice of Mr. Welde, one of the Agents of the colony, a commission was sent to Mr. Pocock and others, of London, to receive all public letters and despatches, and debts due, or donations made, and to dispose of them by direction under the public seal.[3] This commission originated, in part, from the complaints of disaffected persons, hostile to the government of Massachusetts, who had gone to England with their grievances, seeking redress; and this and the next year were marked by a succession of such complaints, which called for the exercise of all that diplomacy for which our fathers had become noted.

A difficulty within the colony was the precursor of the most serious of these complaints, and revived the old struggle between the magistrates and the freemen. An election of military officers had taken place at Hingham; but the people, dissatisfied with the officer sent up for confirmation, made a new choice. The magistrates, taking the part of the rejected candidate, were involved in a dispute with the friends of the second, at the head of whom was Mr. Hobart, the pastor of the church at Hingham, who was apprehended for his alleged insubordination. At the next Court, Mr. Hobart and others, to the number of eighty-one, presented a petition to the deputies craving a hearing, and complain-

May 14, 1645.

[1] Maritime Papers, vol. 1. fol. 168, et. seq.; Mass. Rec's., 2. 79, 82, 116; 3. 16, 17, 38; Winthrop, 2. 235, 238-40, 302-3.

[2] Mass. Rec's., 3. 12. There were difficulties with a number of ships about this date, growing out of the disturbances in England. See Mass. Archives, Maritime Papers; and Mass. Rec's., vol. 3, passim.

[3] Mass. Rec's., 2. 86; Winthrop, 2. 260-1.

CHAP. XII. 1645.

ing of the conduct of the magistrates as an infringement of their liberties. The magistrates refused to consent to a hearing, unless the charges were made specific, and the petitioners named the magistrates they intended. The Deputy Governor, Mr. Winthrop, was named, and two of the petitioners undertook the prosecution. The case was argued long before a decision was effected. Two of the magistrates and many of the deputies were of opinion, that too much power had been exercised, and that the liberties of the people were in danger; but the rest of the deputies, being about one half, and the rest of the magistrates, were of opinion that "authority was over much slighted, which, if not timely remedied, would endanger the Commonwealth, and bring us to a mere democracy." As the issue, the chief petitioners and offenders were fined, and Mr. Winthrop was acquitted.

Throughout the trial, the Deputy Governor had refused to take his usual seat with the magistrates, but placed himself at the bar, and sat uncovered; and, when the decision of the court was pronounced, he desired a hearing, and in a "little speech," vindicated his own conduct, and that of his associates. "The questions that have troubled the country," said he, "relate to the authority of the magistrates, and the liberty of the people. It is yourselves who have called us to this office, and being called by you, we have an authority from God, in way of an ordinance. Civil liberty is the proper end and object of authority, and cannot subsist without it; and it is a liberty to that only, which is good, and just, and honest. This liberty you are to stand for, with the hazard not only of your goods, but of your lives, if need be. Whatsoever crosseth this, is not authority, but a distemper thereof."[1]

[1] Mass. Rec's., 2. 97, 113–14; 3. 270–88, 312; 2 M. H. Coll., 4. 108; 12, 17, 18, 19–26; Winthrop, 2. 3 M. H. Coll., 2. 115.

Happy for the people had such sentiments been appre- CHAP. XII.
ciated by all! But the spirit of faction is not easily allayed; and another, and a more serious disturbance, grew out of the "old root." From the first settlement of the colony, there had been an infusion into its population of persons inimical to the views of the Puritans, who, dissatisfied with the government, both civil and ecclesiastical, were loud in their complaints of arbitrariness and exclusiveness. Attempts had been made by some of these persons, to procure the sanction of the magistrates for the establishment of Presbyterian churches, and the court had gone so far as to express a willingness to concede this point,[1] though anabaptist sentiments, which were beginning to spread, but which were regarded as "an engine framed to cut the throat of the infantry of the churches," had been expressly condemned, and long continued to be persecuted.[2] A proposition had likewise been made for "all the English March, 1643-4. within the United Colonies, to enter into a civil agreement for the maintenance of religion, and civil liberty, and for yielding some more of the freemen's privileges to such as were no church members, that should join in the government;" but "nothing was effected for want of opportunity for meeting."[3] Books in defense of toleration, and advocating anabaptist sentiments, had arrived in the country, and had been put into circulation;[4] and advantage was taken of the temporary ascendency of Presbyterianism in Parliament, to spread the flames of discord in the New World; and, in the estimation of our fathers, "the apparent purpose of advancing religious freedom was made to disguise measures of the deadliest hostility to the frame of

[1] Winthrop, 2. 304.
[2] Mass. Rec., 3. 51, 64; Hutchinson, vol. 1; Clarke's Ill News, in 4 M. H. Coll., 2; Frothingham's Chas'n., 163-73.
[3] Winthrop, 2. 321.
[4] Winthrop, 2. 304; Hubbard, 415.

CHAP. XII.

civil government." The movements of the disaffected were carefully concealed under the guise of enlarging the liberties of the people; and all the elements of opposition were rallied, to aid in carrying out their scheme. It was a struggle analogous to those which had already convulsed the community, in the times of Roger Williams, and Mrs. Hutchinson; and was one of those combinations, necessary to break down the intolerance of the Puritan churches, and eliminate the leaven of bigotry with which they were permeated: — though, like all preceding, and several subsequent struggles, it was crushed by the strong arm of power, and failed of success.

The principal persons connected with this controversy were, William Vassall, of Scituate, a prominent member of the church in that town, and an original member of the Massachusetts Company; Dr. Robert Child, of Hingham, a physician from Padua, and a gentleman of respectable scientific attainments, notwithstanding he was suspected as a "Jesuit;" and Mr. Samuel Maverick, a zealous Episcopalian, who occupied Noddle's Island before the settlement of Boston. The movement began in Plymouth, by a proposition for a "full and free tolerance of religion to all men that would preserve the civil peace and submit unto government; and there was no limitation or exception against Turk, Jew, Papist, Arian, Socinian, Nicolaitan, Familist, or any other." "You would have admired," wrote Winslow, "to have seen how sweet this carrion relished to the palate of most of the deputies."

Oct., 1645.

Knowing, as we do, the views of the Pilgrims, is it surprising that such a proposition alarmed the thoughtful, and was esteemed dangerous above all others to the peace of the churches? The magistrates, accordingly, combined to defeat the movement; and the theater of action was transferred to Massachusetts. Here, a petition was preferred, signed by seven persons, in which they say: "We cannot,

according to our judgment, discover a settled form of government here, according to the laws of England. Neither do we so understand and perceive our own laws or liberties, as that thereby there may be a sure and comfortable enjoyment of our lives, liberties, and estates, according to our due and natural rights, as freeborn subjects of the English nation. There are many thousands, also, in these plantations, freeborn, quiet, and peaceable men, who are debarred from all civil employments; and members of the Church of England, with their posterity, are detained from the seals of the covenant of free grace. We entreat the redress of these grievances; and these things being granted, by the blessing of God to us in Christ, we hope to see the now contemned ordinances of God highly prized; the gospel, much darkened, break forth as the sun at noon-day; christian charity and brotherly love, almost frozen, wax warm; zeal and holy emulation more fervent; jealousy of arbitrary government, the bane of all commonwealths, quite banished; secret discontents, fretting like cankers, remedied; merchandise and shipping, by special providence wasted, speedily increased; mines undertaken with more cheerfulness; fishing with more forwardness; husbandry, now withering, forthwith flourishing; and villages and plantations, much deserted, presently more populous."

It is obvious that this document was designed for a wider circulation than in the single colony of Massachusetts, for copies were rapidly spread into the adjoining governments of Plymouth, Connecticut, and New Haven; "nay, even to the Dutch Plantations, Virginia, and the Bermudas." It was well understood, too, that it was expected to reach English ears, and that it was to be forwarded to Parliament, and pressed on its attention. In fact, it was the most formidable league for the advancement of religious freedom, that had yet been witnessed in New England; and, though there may have been personal ends mixed up

CHAP. XII.

with others of a more general character, the object of the movement was not in itself particularly reprehensible: the only difficulty was, that it was unfortunately urged at the wrong time and in the wrong way to effect much good. For the magistrates of Massachusetts, vigilant to preserve the purity of the churches, and to suppress every attempt to open a breach in the walls of their spiritual Zion, took prompt and decided action in the premises; and a declaration was set forth, in reply to the petition, in which its charges were examined with freedom, if not with cogency.

Nov. 4, 1646.

As an efficient agent would be needed in England to answer these charges, should they reach Parliament, and the charges of Gorton, who had already crossed the Atlantic, Mr. Edward Winslow, of Plymouth, was chosen for that purpose;[1] and, as the matter was one of "great concernment," the elders were called in, Mr. Hobart only being excluded, and the doors being closed, a discussion ensued, embracing the relation of the colonies to England. "By the charter," it was decided, "full and absolute power is conferred upon the Company. No right of appeal is reserved. Parliament cannot violate this charter, or set over us a General Governor without our consent. The colony is as independent as the Hanse Towns of Germany. No new charter is needed, nor can such an one be accepted. The dependence of the colony upon the parent state is chiefly for protection, and the immunities of Englishmen, as free denization, &c."

1646.

Some of the petitioners were preparing to proceed to England to advocate their own cause; but the magistrates, suspicious of their intentions, summoned them to appear and submit to an examination. This examination proving unsatisfactory, they were put under bonds for their second appearance, at which they were fined for their "seditious

[1] Morton's Mem., 123–4; Mass. Rec's., 3. 79. The answer to Gorton is in Mass. Rec's., 3. 95–8, and is a document worthy of notice.

proceedings," three only of the magistrates, Bellingham, Bradstreet, and Saltonstall, dissenting from the verdict. As the conduct of Dr. Child was still menacing, and as he was preparing to leave for England in a ship about ready to sail, to prevent him from carrying over documents to support his charges, his trunks were searched, and the study of Mr. Dand, another of the petitioners, was ransacked, and a large number of "seditious" papers were seized and secured. Once more, therefore, Child and Dand were apprehended, and committed until the ship had left; after which Child was released, "but confined to his house to appear at the next Court of Assistants." CHAP. XII.

Sailing from Boston towards the last of December, Mr. Winslow, on arriving in England, delivered his letters to the Earl of Warwick, and to Sir Henry Vane; and a day of audience was appointed, at which Gorton and his friends appeared, with their complaints, and a brother of Dr. Child, with his petition; but the result was a vindication of the colonists, Parliament disclaiming any intention of interfering in their affairs, or sanctioning appeals from the just decisions of their courts. "We encourage," say they, "no appeals from your decisions. We leave you with all the freedom and latitude, that may, in any respect, be claimed by you."[1] Dec., 1646.

Nor is this decision surprising. Massachusetts had, from the outset, sympathized with Parliament in its contest with the King, and had blended her fortunes with the fortunes of the reformers. She had expressed her willingness to "rise and fall with them," and "sent over useful men, others going voluntarily to their aid, who were of good use, and did acceptable service to the army."[2] Her loyalty, there-

[1] On this affair, see Winthrop, vol. 2; Mass. Rec's., vols. 2, and 3; Winslow's Hypocrisy Unmasked; Child's New England's Jonas; Hutchinson, 1. 136–40, &c.

[2] Winthrop, 2. — John Leverett, afterwards Gov. of Mass., was one of these, and was appointed a Capt. in Rainsborrow's regiment.

CHAP. XII.

fore, procured for her the protection of Parliament. Yet the execution of Charles, which royalists have ever regarded with the utmost abhorrence, was not openly approved here. "I find," says Hutchinson, "scarce any marks of approbation of the tragical scene of which this year they received intelligence."[1] The few allusions we have discovered, are none of them couched in terms of exultation.

1649.

Virginia pursued a different course, and openly resisted Parliament, refused to submit to its decrees, and adhered to the cause of royalty; and, when the Monarch was beheaded, the claims of his son were immediately recognized. The Cavaliers, who emigrated to America, inflamed this spirit of loyalty; and on the shores of the Chesapeake, "every house was for them a hostelry, and every planter a friend." Charles the Second, from Breda, transmitted to Berkley a new commission as Governor; and Virginia remained "whole for monarchy," and was "the last country belonging to England that submitted to obedience of the Commonwealth."[2]

In consequence of this contumacy of the Southern Colonies, a memorable ordinance was passed, empowering the council of state to reduce them to submission; their privileges of trade were cut off; and it was made lawful to seize all ships trading with "the said rebels."[3] Massachusetts passed a similar law, and prohibited intercourse with "Barbadoes, Antigua, Bermudas, and Virginia" until the supremacy of the Commonwealth was acknowledged; but finding this prohibition detrimental to her own commerce, upon the setting forth of the fleet under Sir George Ayscue for the reduction of Barbadoes, the Act was modified, though not fully withdrawn.[4]

Oct. 3, 1650.

May 22, 1651.

Oct. 16.

Yet the legislation of the Commonwealth was not wholly

[1] Hist. Mass., 1. 147.

[2] Hammond's Leah and Rachel, in Force, vol. 3, Tract 13; Bancroft, 1. 211.

[3] Hazard, 1. 636–8.

[4] Maritime Papers, vol. 1. fol. 21; Mass. Rec's., 3. 224, 240; Hazard, 1. 553, 558.

favorable even to Massachusetts. The proclamation relative to Virginia, asserted, in general terms, the power of appointing Governors and Commissioners to be placed in all the English colonies, without exception; and by Mr. Winslow, their agent in England, they were informed, that it was the pleasure of Parliament the patent of Massachusetts should be returned, and a new one taken out, under which courts were to be held, and warrants issued. With this request the people were indisposed to comply; and, too wary to hazard the liberties so dearly purchased, a petition was drawn up, pleading the cause of the colony with great unction, setting forth its allegiance, and expressing the hope that, under the new government, things might not go worse with them than under that of the King, and that their charter might not be recalled, as they desired no better. This remonstrance was successful; the measure was dropped, and the charter of Charles continued in force. Parliament was not "foiled" by the colony. Its request was deemed reasonable; and there was no disposition to invade forcibly its liberties.

CHAP. XII. 1651.

We have evidence of this in the course of Cromwell. After his success in the "Emerald Isle," conceiving the project of introducing Puritanism into Ireland, an invitation was extended to the people of Massachusetts to remove thither, and settle. But they were too strongly attached to the land of their adoption, and to its government, "the happiest and wisest this day in the world," readily to desert it. Hence the well-meant proposal of the Lord Protector was respectfully declined.[2] With their letter in reply to his request, the Petition to Parliament was sent, and his intervention was solicited, to avert the sad consequences apprehended from the recal of the Charter; and though we have no positive evidence that he interposed directly in

[1] Hutchinson, 1. App., 8; Chalmers, Ann., 184; Grahame, 1. 204.

[2] Hutchinson, 1. App., 9; 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 115–18.

CHAP. XII.

their behalf, there are strong probabilities favoring such an inference. His correspondence with Mr. Cotton, is a proof of his sympathy with the colonists;[1] and his offers to induce
1655. them to remove to Jamaica, — a project in which the zealous Gookin was deeply interested,[2] — prove the friendliness of his feelings, and his interest in their welfare.[3] The Scotch prisoners, sent hither after the battle of Dunbar, were an important accession to the population of the country; and a number of these exiles became the founders of families of high respectability.[4]

Meanwhile, as royalty was prostrate, both the Pilgrims and the Puritans moved steadily on in the course they had marked out for themselves, legislating for their own interests, and striving, by all means in their power, to build up and strengthen their infant commonwealths. The former established its council of war;[5] and the latter, to make its bullion available, and to protect itself against a fraudu-
1652. lent currency from abroad, established a mint, which sent forth shillings, and sixpences, and a few coins of a smaller denomination, to be circulated among the people.[6] Yet their relations to the neighboring colonies were not altogether friendly; and especially with the Dutch, difficulties

[1] Hutch. Coll., 233, 236.

[2] N. E. Gen. Reg., 1. 349. June 9. 1655, supplies were voted for the forces in the W. Indies, and provisions were made for sending the same. Maritime Papers, vol. 1. fols. 79–82.

[3] Hutchinson, 1. 175–7; Mass. Rec's.

[4] Hutch. Coll., 235; N. E. Gen. Reg., 1. 377.

[5] Plym. Col. Rec's.

[6] Mass. Rec's., 3. 261, et seq.; Hutchinson, 1. 164; 2 M. H. Coll., 2. 274; Drake's Boston, chap. 34.— John Hull was the mint-master; and that his office was a profitable one, may be gathered from the statement that out of his perquisites, of 15d. for every 20s. coined, he accumulated such a fortune as to be able to settle upon his only daughter, who married Judge Samuel Sewall, a dowry of £30,000. The establishment of this mint by Massachusetts, was a fruitful source of difficulty after the Restoration, and is specified as a prominent charge against the colony, in the instrument by which the charter was dissolved, in 1684. It was regarded by the government as a virtual assumption of independence, and as an encroachment upon the prerogative of the King. But the mint, it should be observed, was set up under the Commonwealth, and the date upon the coins was never altered.

had long existed, which were still in an unsettled state. When war was declared, however, between England and Holland, no disposition was manifested to commence hostilities in America. The Dutch colony at Manhattan, though it did not lack the disposition, was itself too feeble seriously to annoy the settlers of New England; and the merchants of Boston carried on too profitable a trade in those parts, to desire at once to break it up. Hence, in an address from the General Court to Cromwell,[1] the pacific intentions of the people were frankly avowed; nor was it until rumors were circulated by the Indians, that the Dutch Governor was privately soliciting them to a general confederacy to extirpate the English, that alarm spread through all the colonies. But even then, the evidences of the conspiracy were not deemed sufficient to warrant a war. The Dutch disclaimed any sinister intentions, and the elders, to whom the subject was referred, advised that it would be "safest for the colonies" to forbear the use of the sword, but to "be in a posture of defense, and readiness for action, until the mind of God should be more clearly known."[2]

CHAP. XII.

Oct., 1651.

1653.

Upon the repetition of these rumors, the Connecticut colonies were earnest for war; and letters were sent to the Commissioners urging its commencement; petitions to the same effect were presented from towns in Massachusetts;[3] and the Commissioners themselves, all but one, were in favor of complying; but the General Court of Massachusetts interfered, and declared, that "no determination of the Commissioners, though they should all agree, should bind them to join in an offensive war, which should appear to be unjust." This declaration led to an altercation, which seriously threatened the dissolution of the Confederacy; but Massachusetts was firm; the other colonies were

May 26.

[1] Hutchinson, 1. 452.

[2] Mass. Rec's., 3. 208; Hutchinson, 1. 167.

[3] Hutchinson, 1. 167.

CHAP. XII.

weak; and though passion urged resistance, prudence dictated submission. Yet, though compelled by disproportionate strength to yield, the other colonies were not inactive, but sent agents to England for aid; Cromwell ordered three ships to be despatched to assist in the reduction of the Dutch; and Massachusetts was recommended to join in
June 9, 1653. the enterprise. Immediately, the Court was convened, and permission was given to Major Robert Sedgwick, and Capt. John Leverett, who had been commissioned for that purpose by Cromwell, to raise five hundred volunteers, provided "the persons might be free from lawful engagements." But before the expedition could set out, news arrived that
Apr. 5. a peace had been concluded with Holland, and bloodshed was prevented.[1] The troops which had been raised, therefore, instead of being employed against Manhattan, were sent to dislodge the French from Penobscot and St. Johns, of which, for many years, they had held possession; and without much resistance that object was accomplished.[2] The peace with the Dutch, and the "hopeful establishment of government in England," led to an order for a general
Sep. 20. thanksgiving, which was celebrated throughout the colony with the customary rejoicing.[3]

Pending the disputes with the Dutch, new Indian difficulties arose, with the Narraganset tribe, who attacked the Indians at Long Island, under the protection of the English. This act, with the conspiracy of Ninigret, was thought to be sufficient ground for a war; and a resolution was passed,
1653. that two hundred and fifty men should be raised in the several colonies for that purpose; but Massachusetts, still stubborn, refused to raise her quota. For over a year these
1654. hostilities continued; and many "upland Indians" being collected together, a messenger was sent to Ninigret, who

[1] Mass. Rec's., 3. 311–16, 323–9; Hutchinson, 1. 169; 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 230–2.

[2] Hutchinson, 1. 169.

[3] Hutchinson, 1. 169.

returned an answer vindicating his conduct, and asserting that he "did but right his own quarrel, which the Long Islanders begun with him." Upon the receipt of this answer, the Commissioners were once more clamorous for war, and agreed to raise two hundred and seventy foot, and forty horse, out of the several colonies, and gave a commission to Major Simon Willard to command them, with instructions "to take all the forces at the appointed rendezvous, at Thomas Stanton's, by the 13th of October, and thence march to Ninigret, and demand the surrender of all the Pequots under him." CHAP. XII. Sep. 18, 1654. Sep. 25.

Furnished with these instructions, Major Willard set out for the Niantick country; but finding Ninigret and his men had withdrawn to the fastnesses of the swamps, it was judged unadvisable to attack him, and the troops returned, with about a hundred Pequots, who had been left with the Narragansets as prisoners, and for whom an annual bounty was to have been paid.[1] With this demonstration the war ceased; and though there were some disturbances in the colony, which called for the exercise of the utmost vigilance, the condition of the people was generally prosperous, and the affairs of the government were conducted with prudence. Secure in the protection which Cromwell extended to them, sympathizing heartily with the success of the Commonwealth, and anxious for the diffusion of the blessings of the gospel, the Puritans of Massachusetts directed their energies to strengthen the churches which had sprung up amongst them, and to foster the interests of religion and learning. Happy for them had a more generous spirit prevailed in their councils! Happy for them had they better understood the position they occcupied! Happy for them had they listened more attentively to the counsels of the moderate! Then should we have been spared the necessity of present- Oct. 9. Oct. 24.

[1] Hutchinson, 1. 172, and Coll., 261.

CHAP. XII.

ing a picture of the intolerant spirit, which yet reigned supreme, which persecuted others who dissented from their faith, and which filled many hearts and homes with sorrow.

Yet there is much which we can consistently applaud in their conduct. If a persecuting spirit prevailed in Massachusetts, the same spirit prevailed also in all other parts of the world. Behind all this, there were implanted in the minds of the people the principles of liberty, which needed only to be guided aright to lead to the noblest and most beneficent results. And there were not wanting men, in advance of the age, who were destined to be instruments in effecting this change. In a government so popular as was ours at that time, no course subversive of the welfare of all could be adopted, without awakening jealousy and mistrust. Hence the people were cautious whom they placed in authority. The wisest and the best were selected for counsellors. And, as the power of the magistrates was subject to their control, excesses were speedily and effectually checked. Only the most worthy could be sure of support. The factious and turbulent could expect no encouragement. There was vigor and manliness, therefore, in the management of public affairs. The interests of the people were carefully secured; and the growth of liberality, though slow, was certain.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE PRAYING INDIANS. THE QUAKERS.

One avowed purpose of the Massachusetts Colonists, in forsaking their native land and settling upon these shores, was to propagate the gospel among its ignorant inhabitants. The Charter itself takes notice of this purpose; it is alluded to in the earlier letters of the Company; and, although several years elapsed before much was accomplished, and the Indians, as well as others, inquired into the causes of this neglect, the difficulties to be encountered in acquiring the language of the country, the struggles of the emigrants for the means of subsistence, the annoyances to which they were exposed at home and abroad, and the care which their own churches required, in the infancy of their settlement, may be urged in palliation of this neglect, if indeed it requires an apology; and the candid will doubtless acknowledge that, under such circumstances, much could not be expected, nor could much be attained. But, when the severity of their earliest trials was over, and they were at liberty to look around them, to attempt the conversion of these "wrecks of humanity," and to win them to industrious habits, and the arts of civilized life, there was no reluctance to engage in the work, nor were there wanting individuals filled with the spirit which prompted them to undertake it.

It must not, however, be inferred, that nothing had been done towards converting the Indians. Squantum and Hobomok, the allies of the Pilgrims, were taught to adore the "God of the English;" John, the Sagamore of Lynn, with

CHAP. XIII.

his expiring breath commended his son to the care of Mr. Wilson to be religiously instructed; Wequash, the Pequot, was of the "first fruits" of the conversion of his race; and a few in other parts were beginning to inquire into the faith of the white man.[1]

Nor should the labors of Roger Williams be forgotten in this connection, for the "Key" of this excellent man was the first attempt to unlock the mysteries of savage life. Day and night, summer and winter, he labored to acquaint himself with the language of the red race. "Many solemn discourses," says he, "I have had with all sorts, from one end of the country to another. I know there is no small preparation in the hearts of multitudes of them. I know their many solemn confessions to myself, and one to another, of their lost, wandering condition. I know strong convictions upon the consciences of many of them, and their desires uttered that way. I know not with how little knowledge and grace of Christ, the Lord may save, and therefore neither will despair, nor report much."[2]

The submission of divers sachems to the jurisdiction of Massachusetts, opened the way for the action of that government; and, as some of these had expressed the desire "as opportunity will serve, and English live among them, to suffer their children to learn to read God's word, to know God aright, and to worship him in his own way," an

Nov. 13, 1644.

order was passed, that the county courts should "take care that the Indians residing in the several shires, should be civilized, and instructed in the knowledge and worship of God."[3]

John Eliot, of Roxbury, is usually considered as "the morning star of missionary enterprise," and to him has been awarded the appropriate title of the "Apostle to the

[1] New England's First Fruits, ed. 1643, pp. 2–8.

[2] 1 M. H. Coll., 3. 206.

[3] Mass. Rec's., 2. 55–6, 84: 3. 6, 7, under date June 10, 1644, and p. 57, under date Oct. 18, 1645.

Indians." Yet Mayhew, of Nantucket, the "young New England scholar," preceeded him in the field; and though his labors did not spread over so wide a region, they are none the less entitled to the commendation of the philanthropist. We have three letters from the son, giving an account of the progress of the gospel on the island which his father had selected for his abode; and from these it appears, that the year after their arrival, Hiacoomes was converted, and became a preacher to his brethren. Encouraged by this beginning, the younger Mayhew was led to "endeavor the good of these heathen by discourse;" and, through his labors, and those of Hiacoomes, others became religiously impressed; in the short space of five years, thirty-nine men, besides women, had joined his meetings; the next year, the number was increased to "one hundred and ninety-nine, men, women and children;" and in the following year, two hundred and eighty-three persons, exclusive of children, had "renounced their false gods;" a school was established, which was attended by thirty children; a town was projected, to "carry on things in a Civil and Religious way the better;" and a covenant of faith had been drawn up and adopted.[1]

CHAP. XIII.

1643. 1645. Sept. 7, 1650. Oct. 16, 1651. Oct. 22, 1652.

Encouraged in the prosecution of his labors by the Society in England for Propagating the Gospel, Mr. Mayhew continued to cultivate the Vineyard to which he was sent, "sparing not his body by night nor day; lodging in their houses; and solving their scruples and objections;" but business calling him at length to cross the Atlantic, the vessel in which he sailed was lost, and he "ended his days, and finished his work." Severe as was this blow to his aged father, he resolved that the good seed which had been scattered by his son should not wholly perish; and, "striking in with his best strength and skill," a church was gathered,

1657. 1659.

[1] 3 M. H. Coll., 4. 109, 111, 116, 188, 203, 207, 208; Mather, Mag., 2. 372.

CHAP. XIII. Sep. 14, 1674.

and the number of communicants multiplied so rapidly that, before the breaking out of Philip's War, six praying towns were established; two churches were organized, having fifty communicants, over which pastors and teachers were ordained; and connected with these meetings were "the major part of the three hundred families on the Island, and ten Indian preachers of good knowledge and holy conversation." At Nantucket, also, where were a like number of families, a church was gathered, having thirty communicants; forty children and youth had been baptized; and there were three places of worship, and four native teachers. Upon both islands, attention had been paid to the interests of education; some had been taught to read and write Indian; the two grandsons of Mayhew had entered upon the work of teaching the natives; and progress had been made in the arts of civilized life, the men engaging in agricultural pursuits, and the women having learned to "spin and knit."[1]

Such were the results of the labors of the Mayhews, which were among the first fruits of benevolent effort for the conversion of the Indians. These converts remained faithful during the struggle with Phillip; and, though their numbers afterwards diminished, as the white settlements progressed, there is yet a feeble remnant of these original "lords of the soil," dwelling at Gay Head, and at other places in that vicinity, so changed in their habits, however, and in their manners and customs, that they would hardly be recognized by their ancestors of the seventeenth century, and would probably be regarded as a degenerate race.[2]

Turning now to the Massachusetts Colony, we may remark, that, soon after the passage of the Order of 1644,

[1] Gookin, in 1 M. H. Coll., 1. 204–8; Mather, Mag., 2. 373–4.

[2] For more particulars, see Mayhew's Narr., Noyes's Election Sermon, for 1698, Backus, and the Reports to the Mass. Leg., 1848, Sen. 135.

the "renowned John Eliot," the minister of Roxbury, and "a person justly famous in the church of God, not only as an eminent Christian, and an excellent minister among the English, but also as a memorable evangelist among the Indians of New England," entered with enthusiasm upon that work, to the advancement of which more than forty years of his life were devoted, and which was prosecuted with such success, that his labors have been not only applauded in Europe, but his name is mentioned everywhere with uncommon respect, and "all, who contemplate his active services, his benevolent zeal, his prudence, his upright conduct, and his charity, are ready to declare his memory precious."[1] CHAP. XIII.

It was in the fall of 1646, that this excellent man held his first meeting and preached his first Sermon, on the high grounds East of Newton Corner, afterwards called "Nonantum," or "the place of rejoicing;"[2] and three other meetings being held in that vicinity before winter closed, an account of the same was sent to England and published; and Mr. Winslow, the agent of the Colony, immediately engaged in soliciting subscriptions for the furtherance of the work.[3] Oct. 28, 1646.

The field once entered, it was diligently cultivated; meetings were held at Neponset and Concord; at the latter place a "body of laws" was adopted, and request was made for land for a town; and at the next annual Court, one or more magistrates were appointed to hold quarterly courts "where the Indians do ordinarily assemble to hear the word of God;" the sachems were empowered to hold monthly courts, for the trial of small cases; and all fines imposed in these courts were to be devoted to the erection May 26, 1647.

[1] Life of Eliot, by Mather, Eliot, and Moore.

[2] The government immediately approved his course. Mass. Rec's., 3. 100.

[3] 3 M. H. Coll., 4. 8, 17, 22; 1 M. H. Coll., 5. 265; Hutchinson, 1. 153; Jackson's Hist. Newton, 79, &c.

CHAP. XIII.

of a meeting house, or the education of poor children, or other public uses among the natives themselves.[1]

It being the conviction of Mr. Eliot that the *civilization* of the Indians was an essential prerequisite to their *christianization*, his earlier efforts were directed to this end; and with such success, that, aided by Gookin, his constant, persevering and pious companion, those to whom he ministered began to forsake their former habits, and dress like the English; to engage in agricultural pursuits; to build better houses; to catechise their children, and open schools for their instruction; to pray in their families, morning and evening, and give thanks at their meals; to sanctify the Sabbath, and imitate the English generally; and, though idleness seemed to have become second nature, and extreme difficulty was experienced in instilling fixed habits of sobriety and industry, by patience and perseverance a measure of success was attained, though the seeds of indolence were too deeply rooted to be wholly eradicated.[2]

Yet the minds of these sons of the forest were far from being destitute of natural vigor; and the questions propounded by them to their spiritual guides, not only evince shrewdness, and deep penetration, but many of them are of such a character that Eliot must have been sadly puzzled at times to give satisfactory answers. "Suppose," asked one, "a man should be inclosed in iron a foot thick, and then cast into the fire, what would become of his soul, could it escape or not?" "Which was made first," was the query of another, "the devil or man?" The doctrine of innate depravity they could not comprehend. "Why did not God give all men good hearts, that they might be

[1] Gookin, in 1. M. H. Coll., 1. 169, 177; Mass. Rec's., 2. 188–9; 3. 105; 1 M. H. Coll., 8. 15; 3 M. H. Coll., 4. 38–41, 49; Biglow, Hist. Natick; Shattuck's Concord, 24, &c.

[2] 3 M. H. Coll., 4. 15, 88; 1. M. H. Coll., 1. 178, and 3. 178.

good?"—"Why did not God kill the Devil that made all men so bad, he having all power?" Nor was the doctrine that infants were to perish eternally more comprehensible. "Where do children go when they die, seeing they have not sinned?" "Why does God punish in hell forever? man doth not so, but after a time lets them out of prison again. And if they repent in hell, why will not God let them out again?" "Seeing the body sinneth, why should the soul be punished?" And "if all the world be burnt up, where shall hell be?" CHAP. XIII.

Their cases in casuistry were equally shrewd. "Suppose a man, before he knew God, hath had two wives, the first barren and childless, and the second fruitful, bearing him many sweet children, which of the two is he to put away?" "Suppose a man marry a squaw, and she deserts and flies from her husband, and commits adultery with other remote Indians, but afterwards, hearing the word, and sorry for what she hath done, she desires to come to her husband again, who remains still unmarried, shall he receive her or not?" "If a man be wise and his sachem weak, must he yet obey him?"[1]

The exertions of Mr. Winslow led to the formation of a Society for Propagating the Gospel in New England; the ministers of the mother country stirred up their congregations to contribute liberally to its funds; a correspondence was held with the Commissioners of the United Colonies, who were employed as the agents of the Company; and in a short time, a sum yielding £600 per annum was raised, and the proceeds of the same were regularly forwarded for the purchase of clothing, the education of children, the publication of books, the maintenance of teachers, and such other expenses as were incident to the July 19, 1649.

[1] Tracts, in 3 M. H. Coll., 4. 46, 47, 55, 63, 84, 85, 91, 129, 130, 132, &c.

CHAP. XIII.

mission; and these funds were faithfully husbanded, and sacredly disbursed for the purposes intended.[1]

Meanwhile Mr. Eliot continued his labors at Nonantum and Neponset, and occasionally at Concord and other places; and, after three years thus spent, the inhabitants of Dedham, at his request, and with the sanction of the Court, granted to the Indians a township of about six thousand acres, ten miles Southwest of Nonantum, receiving, in exchange, the present township of Deerfield; at the new settlement, afterwards called Natick, the "place of hills," the praying Indians of that vicinity, including some of Concord, were gathered; there their Courts were held; a town was laid out, having three principal streets, two on the North of Charles river, and one on the South; a circular fort was built, palisaded with trees, and a meeting house, fifty feet long, twenty-five feet wide, and twelve feet high, "wel sawen and framed" by the Indians themselves; an arched footbridge was thrown over the river, supported by abutments of stone; a form of civil government, modelled upon the Old Testament, was adopted; large quantities of ground were enclosed and improved for agricultural purposes; schools were established; several of the most promising youths were placed under able masters, and made considerable proficiency in the English, the Latin, and the Greek tongues; and at a subsequent date, one was graduated at Cambridge, with the usual honors.[2]

The women as well as the men were interested in these improvements, and soon learned to spin, and to collect articles for sale. "In the winter, they disposed of brooms,

[1] Morton's Mem., 131–2; 3 M. H. Coll., 4. 162; 1 M. H. Coll., 1. 212, 218, and 3. 177, &c.; Hazard, 1. 635; Hutchinson, 1. 153–6, and Coll., 256–60.

[2] Mass. Rec's., 3. 246, 301; 1 M. H. Coll., 1. 180, 181, and 5. 259, 263; 3. M. H. Coll., 4. 62, 81, 138, 177, 190–1, 227; Biglow's Hist. Natick, 21, 23; Worthington's Dedham, 24–5; Shattuck's Concord, 26, &c., &c.

staves, baskets, and turkies; in the spring, cranberries, strawberries, and fish; in the summer, whortleberries, grapes, and fish; and several of them worked with the English in hay time and harvest."[1] These were the palmy days of the settlement; the days of youthful promise. Imaginative minds saw Satan hurled from his throne, and the Indians forever delivered from his dominion; though the cooler and more sceptical doubted the permanence of these impressions, and the stability of the converts.[2] Yet there is much to commend in these earnest and sincere attempts to improve so degraded a race; and the candid will give due credit to those who engaged in them. CHAP. XIII.

The labors of Mr. Eliot, however, did not end here. Feeling the need of books of instruction, he executed the Herculean task of translating the Bible into the dialect of the Indians, and prepared catechisms, a grammar, a primer, a psalter, and translated other works highly esteemed by our Puritan fathers, all which were printed at the expense of the Society for Propagating the Gospel. Even in old age, he abated not his interest in his work; and his last letters to the President of the Corporation, show how deeply his heart was set on spreading abroad the word of God, and placing it within the reach of the poorest of his converts.

At the restoration of Charles the Second, the enemies of the Corporation endeavored its overthrow, and to divert its resources into his Majesty's coffers, or their own private purses; but, through the intercession of its friends, among whom were conspicuous Dr. Lake, Bishop of Bath and Wells, and Robert Boyle, Esq., his Majesty was pleased to grant a new Charter, continuing several of the old members, and nominating and appointing others, of the 1660,

[1] Homer, in 1 M. H. Coll., 5. 260. [2] Douglas.
See also Neal's N. E., 1. 228.

CHAP. XIII.

nobility and clergy, to conduct its affairs; its revenues were augmented; and its powers were enlarged.[1]

It was to King Charles that the first translation of the
Sept. 5, 1661. New Testament was dedicated by the Commissioners of the United Colonies; and, to carry out the plans of the Corporation, a brick building, called the "Indian College," was erected at Cambridge at its expense, furnished with accommodations for twenty scholars; but, after several had been instructed, most of whom soon died, this, with "other obstructive dispensations of God," led many well wishers "to doubt the success of the enterprise, and some openly contemned it." But despite of these obstacles, Mr. Eliot moved steadily on; and, as the fruit of his toil,
1674. two Indian churches were gathered in the colony, and fourteen praying towns were settled, connected with which were eleven hundred persons "yielding obedience to the Gospel." The war with Philip was a serious interruption to the work. The public mind was poisoned with suspicions of the fidelity of the Indians; and those of Natick and Marlborough, and perhaps of other places, were sent to Deer Island, where they were confined all winter, and endured great hardships. In vain did Mr. Eliot protest against this treatment; and Gookin alone, of the magistrates, had the firmness to second his remonstrances; but, though he thereby exposed himself to the reproaches of his associates, and the insults of the populace, he was too confirmed a patriot to show open resistance, and too ardent a friend of the Indians to allow such conduct to divert or deter him from supporting their cause.[2]

At the close of the war, the effects of this erroneous
1677. treatment were strikingly perceptible, for the number of

[1] Morton's Mem., 132; 1. M. H. Coll., 1, 172, 176; 3. 181–3, 187; 5. 265; 7. 222–8; 8. 12, 33; 10. 9, 11; 2 M. H. Coll., 9. 223–31, 242–3; 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 280–4; Mather, Mag., 1. 511–12; App. Life Boyle, 319–35; Oldmixon, 1. 99.

[2] Gookin, in 1. M. H. Coll., 1. 172–4, 180–95, 228; 1 M. H. Coll., 2. 9; 6. 201; Biglow's Natick, 36-8.

places of meeting was reduced from fourteen to seven; and seven years later, Mr. Eliot could claim but four towns where meetings were statedly held. Yet the Natick church continued many years to maintain its existence; the town was principally settled by Indians; a son of Waban, in whose wigwam Mr. Eliot first preached, held the office of "Town Clerk;" and a succession of pastors conducted services in the rude church of Eliot's day, and those afterwards erected on its site, until the English became most numerous, and an English settlement was incorporated: — but a house of worship still marks the spot where the rude Indian temple stood.[1] CHAP. XIII 1684.

In the Plymouth colony, the propagation of the gospel was likewise attended with success; and Thomas Tupper, and Richard Bourne, of Sandwich, were the first who entered the field of missionary labor. Mr. Cotton, of Plymouth, was an assistant in the work; and we learn, from his letters, and from those of Mr. Bourne, that there were, within the colony, twenty places where meetings were held; and although but one church was gathered, having twenty-seven communicants, and but ninety persons had been baptized, there were nearly five hundred attendants on public worship. Eleven years later, this number had increased to nearly fifteen hundred; and even so late as 1764, there were nearly a thousand Indians in the three counties formerly constituting the old Colony of Plymouth.[2] 1674. 1685. 1764.

Humble as are the labors here recorded, in comparison with the more dazzling accounts of the Jesuits, they are still worthy memorials of the piety of our ancestors. If the value of an enterprise is to be measured by its success, the conversion of the Indians must be regarded as a failure. The race itself has dwindled away, leaving behind few

[1] Biglow's Hist. Natick, 19, 20, 21, 41–3; 1 M. H. Coll., 10. 134; Mather, Mag., 2. 382.

[2] 1 M. H. Coll., 1. 172, 196–9; 3. 188–9, 191; Hutchinson, 1. 156; Mather, 1. 509; 2. 380–2; Mayhew's Narr., 46–53, &c.

CHAP. XIII.

tokens of its presence in the country; and nearly all that remains to remind us of the genius and exertions of Eliot, are the few scattered books which have descended to us from the past, as unintelligible as the inscriptions upon the obelisk of Luxor; yet, like that, they are memorials of the labors of man, and impressive and instructive are the lessons they teach.

From this pleasing picture of the efforts of our fathers for the conversion of the Indians, we must now turn to one which presents us, in contrast, some of the extreme lights and shadows which flit upon the outskirt of Nature's capacious circle, and which, like clouds, obscure the fairest summer's landscape. As the Puritans of New England were fully persuaded of the correctness of their own religious opinions, and came to these shores expressly to build up a new community, from which heresy was to be carefully excluded, the advent of the Quakers was regarded with even greater abhorrence than that of the antinomians, anabaptists, and Gortonists. It was deemed "another assault of Satan upon God's poor people here;" for their doctrines were condemned as "loathsome and pernicious," the "most venomous of all to the churches of America," opening anew that "dead sea of hetorodoxy, that vast and horrid sink, such as makes the land to stink in the nostrils both of God and man, more than the frogs that sometime annoyed Egypt."[1]

The founders of new sects, and their earliest disciples, whose tone of thought is in a habitual state of passionate elevation, and whose aims and objects are usually idealized by the glowing atmosphere of an ardent imagination, are not infrequently characterized by a zeal highly disproportioned to the wisdom which is necessary to regulate and control the same; and to this are we to impute the extrav-

[1] Clap, in Chron. Mass., 361; Bishop's N. E. Judged, 380; Mather, Norton's Heart of N. E. Rent, 2; Mag. 2. 451.

agance of their conduct, and the intemperance of their language. The history of enthusiasm is in all ages the same. Rarely are zeal and moderation so happily and evenly blended in the temperament of self constituted prophets, as to lead to no excesses which are afterwards regretted. It is with sects as with individuals, age cools the impetuosity of youthful passions, and the wildest seldom fail to be sobered by its experience, and instructed by its warnings. Hence the maturity of religious bodies, is usually marked by a more grave and temperate deportment than might have been anticipated from the sallies of their earlier years. It is not surprising, therefore, that even the Quakers, now a quiet and peaceable order of Christians — somewhat singular in their habits it is true, but none the less honest, upright, and sincere — should have been denounced as "fanatics," and should have been guilty of follies, which their more staid and philosophic descendants will concur in acknowledging, must be imputed to the warmth of the neophyte rather than to the wisdom of the disciplined mind.

Of the history of the Quakers prior to their appearance in New England, it is not necessary that we should speak at length. The founder of the sect, George Fox, was a native of Drayton, in Leicestershire, and was the son of Christopher Fox, a weaver by profession, and a man of such integrity that he was called by his neighbors, "righteous Christer." From his earliest years, George, the son, was marked by a gravity of deportment unusual in children; at the age of eleven, he "knew pureness and righteousness;" and during his apprenticeship, such was his honesty, that he "never wronged man or woman in all that time, and it was a common saying among people, if George says *verily*, there is no altering him."[1] There is

[1] Journal, ed. 1694, pp. 2, 3.

CHAP. XIII.

an apparent vanity in such statements, coming from the subject himself, and a lack of attention to the Scripture command, "Let another's mouth praise thee, and not thine own." But whatever of egotism his Journal may display, we cheerfully admit that his morals were exemplary, that his piety was fervent, and that he labored sincerely and zealously for what he regarded as the true doctrines of godliness. Yet his own morals, however pure, did not prevent him from approving acts of his followers of questionable propriety, if not of positive indecency; nor did the fervency of his piety, however vital, preserve him from the insidious, because imperceptible delusions, to which imaginative and melancholic minds are so often subject.[1]

But "dogwhips and horsewhips," "staves, clods, and stones," "mauling with the Bible until the blood gushed from his face," and thrusting into dungeons reeking with filth, were not Christian weapons of conversion, however striking; and the fearlessness with which he rebuked sin; the doctrines of peace which he advocated so consistently; the persistence with which he sought to reform the morals of the people; the personal honesty of himself and his followers; his protests against the practice of robbing the shipwrecked; and his uniform integrity, straight-forwardness, and frankness, are qualities which commendably distinguish him from his opposers, and which may cause us to cast the mantle of charity over the errors of his judgment, or the excesses of his zeal. Quakerism, without doubt, had a mission to perform in the world, or it would never have appeared; and though it is easy to echo the popular cry of heresy, errors of the head may be much more excusable and far less dangerous than errors of the heart, though the latter are more often winked at and

[1] Journal, 24, 54, 55, 56, 59, 103, 146–7, 239.

applauded, than the former are tolerated, and treated with lenity.[1] CHAP. XIII.

It was in 1656, that the first Quakers landed in Massachusetts; and at that date, two women, Mary Fisher, and Ann Austin, arrived from England by the way of Barbadoes. No law forbade their entrance into the country, save the general law against heresy. A month later,[2] eight others arrived, in the Speedwell, of London. These were all imprisoned, deprived of the books which they had brought to circulate, and treated, in some cases, with great indignity; and, as it was feared there was danger of the spread of their opinions, even from prison, they were banished without ceremony, and the masters of the vessels which had brought them hither, were placed under bonds to take them away.[3] July, 1656. Aug. 7.

At the next session of the General Court, a penalty of £100, was imposed upon the master of any ship bringing Quakers within the jurisdiction; and all brought in, were to be sent to jail, whipped twenty stripes, and kept at work until transported. Letters were also written to the Commissioners of the colonies, recommending the passage of laws for the suppression of this sect, and the banishment of its members.[4] In the following year, a fine of forty shillings was imposed upon any one harboring Quakers in their dwellings, for "every hour's entertainment and concealment;" and at a still later date, all encouraging or defending them were to be fined ten shillings, and the speakers in their meetings were to forfeit five pounds. All importing their books were also to forfeit five pounds, and Oct. 14. 1657. May, 1658.

[1] Fox's Journal, 28, 68–9, 121, 144–5, 186, 207, 209, 241.

[2] The date is as in the text, in Bishop's N. E. Judged, p. 3. ed. 1702–3.

[3] Bishop, 3–30; Whiting, 12–13; Besse; Sewall, 203; N. E. Gen. Reg., 1. 132–3; Hutchinson, 1. 180–1; Drake's Boston, 342–3.

[4] Mass. Rec's., 3. 415; Mass. Laws, ed. 1671, 6, 60; Hazard, 1. 630–2, Hutchinson, 1. 181–2, and Coll., 284, 286.

CHAP. XIII. 1658.

a like sum for dispersing or concealing the same. And every person "reviling the office or person of magistrates or ministers as is usual with the Quakers," was to be "whipt or pay the sum of five pounds." Every male Quaker convicted, was, by the law of 1657, for the first offense to lose one ear, and for the second the other; every female was to be whipped; and for the third offense, males and females were to have their tongues bored with a red hot iron. And by a majority of a single vote, and at the instance, as is said, of a clergyman, John Norton, zealous against heretics, the penalty of death was denounced upon all returning to the jurisdiction after being banished. These Draconian statutes were published through the streets of Boston with beat of drum; and more sanguinary enactments it would probably be difficult to produce even from the legislation of the Anglican Church. Thus intense was the bigotry of New England and Old.[1] "Heretical doctrine"—thus argued our fathers—"is not only a sin, but profession of a doctrine which is both all sin, and a way of sin."[2]

In contrast with the above, look at the cotemporary conduct of Rhode Island. Say the government at Providence, in their letter to Massachusetts: "We have no law among us whereby to punish any for only declaring by words, &c. their minds and understandings concerning the things and ways of God, as to salvation and an eternal condition. And we, moreover, find, that in those places where these people aforesaid, in this colony, are most of all suffered to declare themselves freely, and are only opposed by arguments in discourse, there they least of all desire to come, and we are informed that they begin to loathe this place, for that they are not opposed by civil authority, but with all patience and meekness are suffered to say over their

[1] Laws, 1671, 60–62; Fox, passim; Whiting's Truth and Innocency, 145–7; Besse; Hutchinson, 1. 182; Hazard, 2. 399–400, 554, 562; Sewall, 1. 243–4, 249–50.

[2] Norton's Heart of N. E. Rent, 63.

pretended revelations and admonitions, nor are they like or able to gain many here to their way; and surely we find that they delight to be persecuted by civil powers, and when they are so, they are like to gain more adherents by the consent of their patient sufferings, than by consent to their pernicious sayings."[1]

Yet it must not be forgotten that, at a later period, Roger Williams himself was engaged in a controversy with George Fox, the founder of the Quaker sect; and the work of the former, entitled "George Fox digged out of his Burrow," was answered by one equally severe, entitled, "A New England Firebrand quenched, being an answer to a lying, slanderous Book by one Roger Williams, confuting his blasphemous Assertions." There is as acrimonious language in the one as in the other: which proves that the theory of toleration is not always extended to the speech as well as to the life.[2]

Connecticut and Plymouth concurred in adopting laws similar to those of Massachusetts; and even the Dutch, at Manhattan, though the land of their birth was proverbially one where,

> "At Amsterdam, Turk, Christian, Pagan, Jew,
> Staple of sects, and mint of schism, grew;"

so far forgot the proverb as to fall in with the example of their neighbors.[3] Yet in all the colonies there were some who lamented these excesses of sectarian zeal, and strove, though in vain, to stem the current of popular prejudice. Hutchinson and Clarke, of the Massachusetts Colony; Cudworth, Hatherly, and others, of Plymouth; and the benevolent Winthrop, long Governor of Connecticut, are worthy

[1] Hutchinson, 1. 453–4.

[2] Nor was this the only instance in which a jealous if not a persecuting spirit was discovered, as witness his treatment of Wm. Harris, and the cases against Catholics. See Backus, Benedict, Knowles, Staples, &c.

[3] Howgill's Popish Inquisition, ed. 1659, pp. 6, 15–16.

CHAP. XIII.

of mention as among those who protested against the sanguinary laws of their day, and who would gladly have treated more leniently this little sect of plebian philosophers, the insanity of whose zeal, and the intemperance of whose conduct, were paralleled only by the equally insane and intemperate violence of those who opposed, derided, and abused them.[1]

In dealing with repulsive characters and actions, however, it is frequently forgotten, that persecution has been oftener found to strengthen than to weaken the cause against which it is aimed; and the legislation of the New England colonies, with whatever reluctance it may have been adopted, and with whatever casuistry it may have been defended, so far from detering the Quakers from making their appearance in the country, only emboldened them to come the more fearlessly; and, with a stubbornness and pertinacity which incensed and exasperated, they thrust themselves upon the notice of the clergy and the magistrates, and courted rather than shunned the penalties of the laws. Not only were the worthiest imprisoned for pitying them, but large numbers of the Quakers themselves, delicate women, with infants at their breasts, children, whose youth should have protected them from harm, and the aged, whose years should have excited compassion, were alike scourged, imprisoned, and fined: — nay, some were sent off, and sold into slavery![2] Appeals to England were treated with contempt; and Endicott, Wilson, Norton, and others, urged on the work of persecution, until a resilience was produced, — until the people recoiled from the scene of blood; with loathing and abhorrence, repented of their misdeeds; and clamored for the repeal of the most bar-

[1] Bishop, 157–8, 168–76; Coddington's Demonstration, 9.

[2] "Your cruelties," says Coddington, Demonst., 7, "have filled the contents of two printed treatises hitherto, which is the world's wonder, and the astonishment of all that are men of ingenuity and tenderness."

barous statutes. It was no squalid pantomime, but a terrible tragedy which was acted by our fathers. There were gradations of cruelty in their treatment of the Quakers; and the severity of their punishment increased in arithmetical progression. For, from imprisonment, they proceeded to fines and confiscations; from fines and confiscations, to whipping with the knout; from whipping to mutilation, and cutting off ears; from mutilation to banishment; from banishment to servitude; and from servitude to death. "You are court, jury, judge, accusers, witnesses, and all," said Coddington. Mr. Wilson seemed beside himself as the sad work proceeded. "I would carry fire in one hand," said he, "and fagots in the other, to burn all the Quakers in the world." "Hang them," he cried, "or else" — and with a significant gesture he passed his hand across his throat.[1]

It is an insufficient apology for such preposterous madness, that the conduct of the Quakers was in itself highly provoking. John Norton might say,

> "Region, Estate, Rule Civil and Divine,
> Religion, All they seek to undermine:"[2]

that was no excuse for whipping and hanging.[3] What if one of that sex whom all delight to honor, laying aside the usual delicacy of woman, begrimed herself with coal-dust, as emblematic of the black-pox which God was about to send forth upon all carnal worshippers? What if others, in sombre attire, paraded the streets, proclaiming the speedy arrival of an angel, with a drawn sword, to take vengeance upon the people? And what if still another,

[1] Bishop, 124, 141; Whiting, 79; Coddington's Demonstration, 11.

[2] Heart of N. E. Rent, 60.

[3] "When," asks Fox, p. 4, Ans. to New Laws of Rulers of Boston, ed. 1678: "when did ever the true Apostles and Teachers, whip, hang, brand with an hot iron, banish upon pain of death, and spoil the goods?"

CHAP. XIII.

with a modesty closely allied to prurience, outdoing the legend of Godiva of Coventry, in a state of entire nudity presented herself in the public assembly, in the midst of divine service, as an illustration of the spiritual nakedness of the colonists? What if Faubord, to rival the faith of Abraham, proceeded with his own hands to sacrifice his son, and was prevented from accomplishing his object only by the interference of his neighbors? What if all denounced the magistrates, vilified them as worthless trees cumbering the ground, and invoked upon them the direst judgments of God? Such extravagances, if noticed at all, should have been treated with the mild discipline of a lunatic asylum, rather than met by a fanaticism equally reprehensible, and equally abhorrent to the sensitive mind.[1] Yet it was the doctrine of those days, and openly avowed, that "the very light of nature teacheth all nations, that madmen, acting according to their frantick passions, are to be restrained with chains, when they cannot be restrained otherwise."[2]

Four victims the scaffold claimed, before the tide of persecution ebbed. William Robinson, Marmaduke Stevenson, and Mary Dyer, were the first who suffered; and in the account of their trial, and of the scene at their execution, there is much that excites both pity and disgust. It will hardly be believed, that they were guarded by soldiers lest the people should rescue them; that drums were beat to drown their voices; and that, when the bodies of the men had fallen to the ground, they were treated with inhuman indignity and scorn.[3] "We desired their lives absent, rather than their death present," was the best excuse the magistrates could offer.

William Leddra was next placed upon trial; but in the

[1] Bishop, 373, 386; Whiting, 43; Mather, 1. 453–5; Hutchinson, 1. 187, and Coll., 327.

[2] Norton, 52.

[3] Besse, Bishop, Sewell, &c. See also Coddington's Demonstration, ed. 1674, p. 6.

very midst of the proceedings of the Court, Wenlock Christisson, already banished on pain of death, came boldly forward, and, confronting the magistrates, whom his appearance dismayed, protested against their conduct, and warned them of its consequences. Upon his own trial he demanded, by what law they condemned him? When it was anwered, "our own" — "Who empowered you to make that law?" was his immediate inquiry. And when the patent was pleaded, "can you make laws," he asked, "against those of England?" None but a negative reply could be returned. "Then," added he, "have you overstepped your bounds, and your hearts are as rotten towards the King as towards God." It was useless to continue the controversy, and a verdict of guilty was promptly pronounced. "I deny all guilt," was the fearless rejoinder: "My conscience is clean in the sight of God." When the sentence of death was passed, "What do you gain," he exclaimed, "by taking Quakers' lives? For the last man you put to death, here are five come in his room; and if ye have power to take my life, God can raise up ten in my stead."[1] CHAP. XIII.

Intelligence of the proceedings of the colonists soon reached England; and Edward Burroughs, waiting upon his Majesty, Charles the Second, who had recently been restored to the throne of his father, said: "There is a vein of blood opened in your dominions which, if not stopped, will overcome all." "I will stop that vein," was the prompt reply. "Then do it speedily," said the ally of Fox, "for we know not how soon many may be put to death." "As speedily as ye will," was the answer of his Majesty; "call to the Secretary, and I will do it presently." The Secretary was called; a mandamus was granted; and permission was given the Quakers to forward it by whom they pleased. Samuel Shattuck was selected as the messenger, Sep. 9, 1661.

[1] Bishop, 336–40.

CHAP. XIII.

who had already been banished from New England on pain of death, and a ship was hired for his conveyance to America.

Little can we conceive the consternation which was produced, when, on the Sabbath, the news spread through Boston, that there "was a vessel in the harbor filled with Quakers," and that "Shattuck, the devil, and all had come."[1] But the passengers were kept close until the following day, when Shattuck, the King's Deputy, and Goldsmith, the Captain of the ship, walked to the residence of Governor Endicott, and knocked for admission. "Your business," was the inquiry of the servant. "We come from the King," was the reply, "and can deliver our message to the Governor alone." Being admitted, the Governor came to them, and ordered Shattuck's hat to be taken off; but when the Mandamus was placed in his hands, he took off his own hat, and returned that of the messenger. The Deputy Governor was sought, and a consultation was held; and the laconic reply was: "We shall obey his Majesty's command." Liberty was given the passengers to land; a number of "Friends" were released from prison; and there was a general re-union and rejoicing among them.[2]

The compliance of the Magistrates with the Mandamus of the King was reluctantly given; and policy alone probably induced consent. For the Quakers did not escape without some punishment. Two at least were whipped through the streets, and driven into the wilderness; two were remanded to prison; and two, who had been once banished, were whipped at the cart's tail in three several towns. Yet, to propitiate the favor of the King, and to prevent prejudice from the complaints of the Quakers, and others, messengers were sent to England by the colony.

[1] Fox, 241–2; Besse, 2. 226; Bishop, 345; Sewall, 1., vol. 1.

[2] Bishop, 345.

Mr. Bradstreet and Mr. Norton were the persons selected, and they were favorably received by the King: but no sooner did the Quakers hear of their arrival, than they called them to an account for the murder of their friends, and demanded redress for the wrongs they had suffered. The messengers were alarmed; but the Quakers were lenient, and they escaped uninjured.[1]

From this date the rigor of the colonial laws abated; and, though disturbances continued for upwards of twenty years, and large sums of money were extorted, and a vast amount of suffering endured in the earlier stages of their persecution, as their own conduct became more tractable, and as they became sensible of the folly of their former course, and sobered down into quiet and peaceable citizens, they were suffered to remain in the colony without special molestation; though never, under the Charter government, were they treated with mildness. We have no disposition to exonerate the Puritans of Massachusetts from blame in their treatment of the Quakers. Forgetting that themselves were "judged in their judgment, and executed in their execution," they allowed their horror of heresy to transport them beyond the bounds both of reason and justice; and the irregular and tumultuous modes of redress which they unhappily adopted, seriously reflect upon their moderation and prudence. The principles of toleration, however, were but little understood at that time, and only to a slight extent had they gained ground over blind bigotry. They were exceedingly obnoxious to the arbitrary temper of many of the politicians of the colony, and wanted, perhaps, experimental proofs of their safety and efficacy to recommend them to the cordial adoption of all. Yet it is worthy of notice, that what all would now concur in censuring as reprehensible, if practised at the present day,

[1] Fox, 243–4; Besse, 2. 270; Bishop, 46–7, 352; Coddington's Demonstration, 7–8.

CHAP. XIII.

sprung then less from the rancor of superstition, than from political motives, upon which the laws against dissent adopted by the Anglican Church, and copied by the Puritans, were principally based. There was doubtless enough superstition in the creed of the colonists; and if we have outgrown the same, let us be thankful for it. But let us not censure too harshly the conduct of men to whom we are so largely indebted for the blessings we enjoy. We would, so far as possible, cast over their errors the mantle of charity. We have no disposition to conceal those errors, neither would we magnify them to an undue extent. Future ages, perhaps, in considering the laws of the middle of the nineteenth century, will look back with wonder to our days, and may find it as difficult to conceive how we should have strayed so far from that spirit of the gospel as then understood, as we find it difficult to conceive how our ancestors should have strayed so far from that spirit as we understand it. Let each age be judged by its own light, and let due credit be given for all that was good in the past. Laws have been passed, even in our own days, which prove that we have little reason to boast of our superior enlightenment.

CHAPTER XIV.

MASSACHUSETTS AND CHARLES THE SECOND.

THE return of the Stuarts to the English throne was not altogether unexpected in the colonies. The events of the last three years had satisfied the people that the Commonwealth was losing ground; and the incompetency of Richard Cromwell, who was never proclaimed Protector here,[1] awakened apprehensions of the defeat of the new government, and the restoration of the old. That this result was not fervently prayed for, we may reasonably believe. Yet if dreaded, it was principally because it was feared there would be a change in the government, and the Puritans would be compelled to abate their exclusiveness. Despite of all efforts to prevent innovations in religion, many not friendly to the Puritan creed had succeeded in gaining admittance into the country; the leaven of their opinions, which persecution could not destroy, was rapidly spreading; and among the masses, if not among their rulers, there was a restlessness under the intolerance which had hitherto prevailed, and a desire to extend the privileges of citizenship, by breaking down the barriers reared against dissent, and admitting to the exercise of the elective franchise all of good character and peaceable deportment.

The progress of nations as of individuals, is governed by fixed and determinate laws. Not consciously, perhaps, do we work out at all times the problems of our destiny. The motives of actions are often more circumscribed than

[1] Hutchinson, 1. 193, note; Hubbard, 576; Chalmers, Ann., 249.

CHAP. XIV. 1660.

the results which attend them. A few, here and there, are moved by an inward and mysterious impulse to throw off conventional restraints, and to act on a broader plane. Their course is resisted by the dominant powers. Yet the issue is generally the progress of truth. The position of the English Church, in the earliest stage of its reformation, was a step in advance of the Church of Rome. It made a Pope for each country, instead of one Pope for the world. Puritanism was an advance upon the position of the Anglican Church, as it claimed for each man individual rights. The fruits of this last principle could not instantly mature. But a partial development immediately followed. A more perfect unfolding time only could effect. And America was the destined field of their highest expansion. Here, outwardly, everything was favorable to liberty; and inwardly, there was a desire to secure and enjoy it.

The ground already travelled has brought to notice some struggles for the advancement of freedom. Apparently but little change had hitherto been wrought. But the controversies which had so deeply agitated the people, stirred up the waters preparatory to their purification and life-giving efficacy. Puritanism, indeed, was still groping darkly along. Its mission was not accomplished. Its policy was a policy adapted to its circumstances, but not comprehensive enough for the world at the present day. Yet even in the infancy of a nation, the germs of its riper years are often perceptible. The seed was of the right sort sown by our fathers, and if some tares were mixed with it, in what field are none found? That seed was watched over, and rapidly grew. Priests planted, and rulers watered; but the Majesty of Heaven alone gave the increase.

On the theater of the world, no movement is isolated. Changes in one country produce changes in another. All nations are alike actors in the great drama of life. If

monarchy was for a season abolished in England, princes were admonished to beware of its abuses. If the Commonwealth failed, because it was premature, subjects were taught to deserve freedom before demanding it. To America both revolutions were pregnant with instruction. And now that monarchy was restored, we shall find the new order of things fraught with its lessons of wisdom; and the consequences resulting were as important to the mother country, as to her several dependencies. CHAP. XIV.

The proclamation in England of Charles the Second, took place in May, and in July the tidings were received in Massachusetts by the ships which brought the regicides Goffe and Whalley; but no notice was publicly taken of the event, nor was any change made in the forms of the public acts and proceedings.[1] If the declaration from Breda arrived at the same time, it was probably regarded with suspicion and mistrust.[2] At the October Court, a motion for an address to the King was negatived. It was time enough to recognize his authority when it became permanent. Rumor represented England as still in an unsettled state, and until different intelligence was received, delay was deemed prudent, nor could it be construed into neglect. At length the government was certified of the proceedings of Parliament, and was informed that its enemies had revived, and that his Majesty's Council was besieged with their complaints. Delay was no longer prudent; the position of the colonies must be openly defined. Hence a Court was convened, and addresses were prepared for the King and the Parliament.[3] The style of these addresses has been censured as fulsome.[4] The agency of the clergy in their preparation is apparent; but, with the exception of hyperboles drawn from the Old May 26, 1660. July 27. April. Oct. 19? Nov. 30. Dec. 19.

[1] Hutchinson, 1. 194; Chalmers, Ann., 250.
[2] Hallam, Const. Hist., 406.
[3] Hubbard, 557–61; Hutch. Coll., 325–9; Chalmers, Ann., 250, 264–8; Hazard, 2. 579–86.
[4] Ebeling, 1. 954, in Bancroft, 2. 71.

CHAP. XIV. 1660.

Testament, and metaphors according with the customary adulation of princes in the East, they are straightforward, consistent, and manly productions. With these addresses, letters were forwarded to several gentlemen of note, and instructions were sent to Mr. Leverett, their agent, a large portion of whose life was spent in the service of the colony, in which, after requesting him to deliver the addresses at the earliest opportunity, to interest as many as possible to favor the cause of the colonies, and to obtain speedy information of his Majesty's sense of their petition, they proceed to say:

"If the King or Parliament should demand what these privileges are which we desire the continuance of, your answer may be, all those which are granted us by patent, and that we have hitherto enjoyed in church and commonwealth, without any other power imposed over us, or any other infringement of them, which would be destructive to the ends of our coming hither. As also that no appeal may be permitted from hence in any case civil or criminal, which would be such an intolerable and insupportable burthen, as this poor place, at this distance, are not able to undergo, but would render authority and government vain and ineffectual, and bring us into contempt with all sorts of people. And if you find the King and Parliament propitious to us, to use your utmost endeavors for the renewing that ordinance that freed us from customs, 10th March, 1642.

"Upon any matter of complaint by any of his Majesty's subjects or others, relating to the bounds and limits of our patent, our humble desire is that we may have notice thereof, and liberty to answer for ourselves, before any determination of conclusion be made against us, which being done, we shall finally acquiesce in such issue as his Majesty, the high court of Parliament, or any substituted by them, shall put thereto.

"If any objection be made that we have forfeited our patent in several particulars, you may answer, that you desire to know the particulars objected, and that you doubt not but a full answer will be given thereto in due season."[1] CHAP. XIV.

This address of the colony was graciously received, and a reply, signed by Mr. Secretary Morrice, was returned,[2] which, with a mandate for the apprehension of Goffe and Whalley, reached Boston the following May.[3] In accordance with this mandate, an order was issued to search for the regicides; but they had fled to Connecticut, after remaining for a time in Massachusetts, during which they were hospitably entertained, appeared in public, and attended meetings on the Sabbath and on other occasions; and upon their arrival in the former colony, they were so effectually secreted by their friends, that their retreat was never discovered; and, after living in several places, and being joined by one of their companions, Col. Dixwell, they died in peace in the land of their exile.[4] Feb. 15, 1660-1. Mar. 5. May 6, 1661.

Previous to the reception of the King's reply, the attention of the Court was called to a work which had been published by John Eliot, the amiable and liberal apostle to the Indians, giving his views of a "Christian Commonwealth." In this little treatise, he was conceived to have "manifestly scandalized the government of England by kings, lords, and commons, as antichristian," and, by implication, had "justified the late innovators;" and however innocent the work may have been deemed at the date of its first appearance, yet, as its doctrines were become heretical, he was requested to "recant." The conclusion Mar. 17, 1660-1. 1654.

[1] Hutch. Coll., 330–1.
[2] Hubbard, 561–2; Hutch. Coll., 333.
[3] Hutchinson, 1. 195; 3 M. H. Coll., 7. 123.
[4] For a full sketch of their history, see Stiles's Judges. Comp. also Hutchinson, 1, 197–201; 3 M. H. Coll., 7. 124–8; 3 M. H. Coll., 1. 60–2; Trumbull, 1. 242–6.

CHAP. XIV.

of his disclaimer is strikingly significant: — "All form of civil government deduced from Scripture, I acknowledge to be of God, and to be subjected to for conscience sake. And whatever is in the whole epistle or book inconsistent herewith, I do at once most cordially disown."[1]

The situation of the colonies was still highly critical, nor could a general expression of favor from the King entirely allay the apprehensions which existed. A "Council for the Colonies," invested with powers of general superintendence had been established, followed by a Committee for the settlement of the government of New England; and reports were in circulation that Virginia and the Islands had been forbidden to trade with New England, and that three frigates would soon be sent over, with a General Governor, to take charge of the affairs of the plantations.[2] The King had been informed of the proceedings of a Society in his own realms, which met every Saturday at Cooper's Hall, for the interests of the colonies, and to keep alive the "old cause of enmity to regal power;" the Committee for Plantations had surmised that Massachusetts would, at any moment, cast off her allegiance, and effect an alliance with Spain, or resort to some other as desperate remedy rather than admit of appeals from her authority; a controversy arose upon this; and the government resolved to establish the principle which the Long Parliament had waived, and to insist upon subjecting that colony to the Act of Navigation.[3]

Dec., 1660.

May 19, 1661.

For these reasons, although a day of thanksgiving was appointed, to "acknowledge the favor of Heaven in inclining the King graciously to accept and answer the address made to him,"[4] at the annual session of the General Court,

May.

[1] Hutchinson, 1. 195–6; Hubbard, 575; M. H. Coll.; Mass. Rec's.

[2] 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 280, 281; Hubbard, 715; Hutchinson, 1. 196; Chalmers, Revolt, 1. 99.

[3] Hubbard, 715; Hutchinson, 1. 196; Chalmers, Ann, 241, 244; Leverett, in Hutch. Coll., 339.

[4] Mass. Rec's.; Hutchinson, 1. 196.

a Committee of twelve was chosen to consider and report upon all matters touching the relation of the colony to England; and at a special session, convened for the purpose, a "Declaration of natural and chartered rights" was presented and approved. In this document, the position of the colony and the views of its leaders are set forth with clearness, boldness and precision. The patent is assumed as the principal foundation of the government, by which the Governor and Company "are a body politic in fact and in name." This body may make freemen, and these freemen may choose officers. The government has power to determine what officers are necessary, and to define their duties; it has full authority, both legislative and executive, ecclesiastical and civil, over residents and strangers; and that without appeals, except where its laws are palpably repugnant to the known laws of England. It is likewise its privilege forcibly to defend itself, by land and by sea, against all attempting its destruction or annoyance. And any imposition prejudicial to the country, and contrary to its own laws, is declared an infringement of its vested rights. Its duties of allegiance are, To maintain the right of the King to the country, and not to subject it to any other potentate; to preserve his person, and prevent conspiracies; to seek his peace, and discharge with fidelity the duties committed to them; to punish crimes against his crown and dignity; and to propagate the gospel "according to the faith given by our Lord Jesus Christ in his word:"—and these things premised, it is claimed to be consistent with the loyalty and obedience of subjects thus privileged, to plead with their prince against all endeavoring to violate their rights.[1]

CHAP. XIV.

Jun. 10, 1661.

Of a people holding such opinions, the advocates of high prerogative might well be jealous. There was a degree

[1] Hutchinson, 1. 196–7, 456–7; Hazard, 2. 590–2.

CHAP. XIV.

of independence which the colonies always claimed; and their allegiance was bounded chiefly by the patent. Within that, they were supreme; yet within that, they recognized the power of England. And so long as their patent was preserved to them inviolate, and they were left unmolested, and the rights it conferred were not infringed or interfered with, so long were they obedient and peaceable subjects. They interpreted their charter favorably on their own behalf, and it was stipulated in the instrument itself that it should be so construed; but their interpretation was not always consonant to the wishes of the parent state; and hence the struggle, on the one hand to retain, and on the other to restrain, the powers and privileges which were claimed and exercised.

Aug. 8, 1661. More than a year elapsed from the restoration of Charles the Second to his public recognition in the Massachusetts June 5. Colony. Plymouth readily acknowledged his authority;[1] Massachusetts delayed as long as was prudent. Old England welcomed his return with riotous festivity: New England forbade even the drinking his health. In the former country, in the quaint language of the past,

> "The rich, the poor, the old, the young, agree
> To celebrate a joyful jubilee;
> And to the utmost all themselves employ,
> To make free demonstrations of their joy.
> Some quaff full goblets of the richest wine,
> And others make the blazing bonfires shine;
> Whilst the devout their prayers to heaven sent,
> For blessings on the king and government."[2]

In Massachusetts a few formalities were observed on the occasion, and the troops were paraded; but the people Aug. 8. behaved with decorum and discretion. An address was agreed to, but it seems never to have been sent.[3]

[1] Hazard, 2. 590.

[2] Wolcott, in 1 M. H. Coll., 4. 262.

[3] Hutchinson, 1. 200; Chalmers, Ann., 254; Hubbard, 575-6; Endicott, in 3 M. H. Coll., 1. 51–3; Hull's Diary, in Drake's Boston.

In the autumn, a letter was received forbidding further persecution of the Quakers, and requiring "the said persons to be sent over to England." This letter was read, and those laws whose penalty was corporal punishment or death, were suspended until further order. Soon after, orders were received for commissioners to be sent to answer to the accusations against the colony, and a court was convened for the purpose of choosing such. The action of the magistrates was not wholly harmonious. A majority were for sustaining, with the charter, an independent government in undiminished force; a minority were willing to make some concessions. The Governor and Deputy sided with the former, and, though chosen members of the committee, declined participating in its councils.[1] It was only "after much agitation and opposition," that John Norton and Simon Bradstreet, both of whom had signalized themselves in the persecution of the Quakers, could be persuaded to undertake the mission; and then they were rather pressed into the service than induced voluntarily to accept. Indeed, so "hazardous" was the enterprise, that twelve meetings at least were held at the "Ancor taverne" in the course of a single month, before the arrangements for their departure could be perfected. Money was to be raised to defray their expenses; the consent of the church for the absence of Mr. Norton was to be obtained; answers to the complaints against the colony were to be prepared; the instructions of the commissioners were to be discussed and determined; they demanded security from personal damage; and their scruples of the propriety of their mission were to be satisfied.

CHAP. XIV.

Nov. 27, 1661.

Dec. 31.

Finally, the commission was signed; their instructions were filled out; an address commending them to the King was prepared, and another soliciting the favor of the Earl of Clarendon; letters were written to a number of the

[1] Hutchinson, 1. 201–2, and Coll., 348, 349, 364.

CHAP. XIV.

friends of the colony, beseeching their intercession; a ship, the Society, was hired to transport them across the Atlantic; and all things seemed ready for the commencement of their voyage, when an unforeseen obstacle arose, occasioned by the sickness of Mr. Norton, brought on, without doubt, by over anxiety. In hope of his recovery, an order was passed to detain the ship five days on demurrage; to this the Master objected; a correspondence with Mr. Norton ensued; but his answers were so unsatisfactory, that the ship was released, and the whole business seemed on the point of failing entirely, when, at the last moment, Mr. Norton rallied, and signified his readiness to set out on the eleventh of February, but was enabled to start the day previous, and then took his departure in company with Mr. Bradstreet.[1]

Feb. 10, 1661-2.

Meetings had been held in England for the discussion of the affairs of the colonies before the arrival of these agents, and their reception was more favorable than was at first expected. Aware of the spirit of the colonists, ignorant of their strength, and conscious of his own weakness, the natural aversion of the Monarch to the dry details of business led to a response, supposed to have originated with Clarendon, which, upon certain conditions, confirmed their charter privileges, and granted an amnesty for all past offenses, except to those attainted by Parliament of high treason.[2] This letter, agreeably to its tenor, was ordered to be published; and a day of thanksgiving was appointed for the safe return of the messengers, and "the continuance of the mercies of peace, liberties, and the gospel."[3]

Jun. 28, 1662.

Oct. 8.

Yet were there some things in the letter of the King hard to be complied with. A rebuke was administered for the irregularities which had been complained of in the gov-

[1] Hutch. Coll., 345–374.
[2] 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 282; Hubbard, 576–7; Hutch. Coll., 377–80.
[3] Mass. Rec's.

ernment, and it was intimated that a renewal of the charter was expected to be sought "under the great seal of England." A revision of the laws of the colony was also enjoined; the Oath of Allegiance was to be taken by all; the administration of justice was to be thenceforth in the King's name; and "since the principle and foundation of the charter was and is the freedom of liberty of conscience," the rights of citizenship were to be conceded to peaceable Episcopalians; all persons of honest life, except Quakers, were to be admitted to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and their children to baptism; and "all freeholders of competent estate, not vicious in conversation, and orthodox in religion, though of different persuasions concerning church government," were to "have their vote in the election of all officers, civil and military." In consequence of these provisions, as the influence of the letter extended to the churches as well as to the civil state, in the order for its publication "all manner of acting in relation thereto" was to be "suspended until the next General Court, that so all persons concerned may have time and opportunity to consider of what is necessary to be done in order to his Majesty's pleasure therein."[1] CHAP. XIV. 1665

At a later date, perhaps, these requisitions would not have been deemed wholly unreasonable, and they were far less exceptionable than many of the demands of the King; but at that time, both magistrates and ministers were exceedingly jealous of admitting the principle of a negative on their acts, or anything which seemed to encroach upon their immunities. In vain did Mr. Norton protest that, if the demand of the Monarch was not literally complied with, "the blood that should be spilt would lie at their door." It was intimated in no ambiguous phrase that his mission was a failure, and better never have been

[1] Hutchinson, vol. 1; Chalmers, Ann., 255.

CHAP. XIV.

undertaken; and so powerful was the effect of this treatment upon one of a naturally melancholy temperament, that he relapsed into a desponding condition, and soon after died. Mr. Bradstreet, who had more firmness, and who was better acquainted with the perversities of men's humor, conscious that he had not intentionally compromitted the honor of the colony, bore these rebuffs with unshaken composure.[1]

Apr. 5, 1663.

There were not wanting, however, some, to whom the advice of Mr. Norton seemed both prudent and just. The friends of toleration had for several years been gaining ground; and a strong party was springing up, which promised soon to become more conspicuous, and to work a marked revolution in the policy and the destiny of the country. But the exclusive spirit which had hitherto prevailed in the colonial councils, and which was necessary, in a measure, under the circumstances in which the people were placed, was now at its height. Its mission was not ended. There was more work for it to do while the interests of the country were jeopardized; nor could it have been safely dispensed with, perhaps, until the relations of the colonies to the mother country became better understood, and a reciprocity of interests was established, which relieved the former of their fears for their own safety, and the permanence of the settlements which had been effected at such cost.

The directions of his Majesty were not carried into immediate effect. His letter was made public, and writs and processes were ordered to be issued in his name. A committee was also appointed to consider what further should be done, and report at the next session; and liberty was given the "elders" and the "freemen," and even "any other inhabitants," to send in their thoughts, so that, after

[1] Hutchinson, vol. 1; Moore's Governors, 383–4.

due consultation, something might be concluded "satisfactory and safe, conducing to the glory of God, and the felicity of his people."[1] At the same time, a censorship over the press was established, lest dissensions should be increased;[2] and the government became more vigilant than ever in strengthening itself for the struggle it was destined to encounter. CHAP. XIV. 1662.

This struggle soon followed. False rumors, and true reports, both assisted to incense the court at St. James. It was said that Whalley and Goffe, the fugitive regicides, were at the head of an army;[3] and that the union of the colonies in 1643, was a war combination for the express design of throwing off their dependence on England.[4] In vain Lord Say and Seal, now tottering beneath the weight of years and disease, appeared in their defense. In vain he declared their accusers to be rogues; that they belied the country; and that "he knew New England men were of altogether another principle." Addresses had been received "from the great men and natives of those countries," complaining of "breach of faith, and acts of violence and injustice which they had been forced to undergo;" old grudges yet rankled in the bosoms of enemies; the partial and reluctant compliance of the colonists with the King's demands was in itself ominous; and hence the settlement of the Plantations in New England having been "seriously debated and discoursed," and the Lord Chancellor having declared that "his Majesty would speedily send Commissioners to settle the respective interests of the several colonies," at a subsequent date the Council for the Colonies represented to his Majesty that "New England had, in those late times of general disorder, strayed into many

Sep. 25, 1662.

Jan'y., 1662-3.

[1] Hutchinson, 1. 205; 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 47–8.
[2] Hutchinson, 1. 236; Bancroft, 2. 76.
[3] Lett. of Sir T. Temple, in 3 M. H. Coll, 7. 127, and in Bancroft, 2. 76.
[4] Lett. to T. Prince, in 1. M. H. Coll., 5. 192.
[5] Hubbard.

CHAP. XIV. 1662-3. enormities, by which it appeared that the government there had purposely withdrawn all manner of correspondence, as if they intended to suspend their absolute obedience" to his authority.[1]

Nor can it be questioned that the conduct of the colonists furnished some grounds for such charges. The Synod, which had been held by order of the General Court, and in which the celebrated "half-way covenant" was adopted, was significant in its bearings upon the King's requisitions;[2] their treatment of Capt. Breeden, who had complained of them in England for harboring regicides, and who, now returning, and behaving with insolence, was cast into prison, and fined £200, admitted of a construction adverse to their interests;[3] as did also their lenity towards Isaac Cole, the Constable of Woburn, who was charged with refusing to publish the King's letter, and Edward Converse, one of the Selectmen of that town, who had spoken disrespectfully of this letter as tending to popery, both of whom, though held to answer for a high misdemeanor, escaped because the charges against them were not fully proved.[4] It might be urged in favor of the colony, that they had so far complied with the instructions of Charles, as to grant liberty to certain French Protestant refugees to settle in Massachusetts; but care was without doubt taken to be first satisfied that they were orthodox in doctrine, and conformable to the government of the country.[5]

Sept., 1662.

The intercessions of Sir Thomas Temple, Cromwell's Governor in Acadia, who had resided some years in New England, and John Winthrop, the Governor of Connecticut, were more effective, and led to a message from Clarendon,

[1] 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 284; Chalmers, Ann., 386, and Revolt, 1. 112; Hubbard, 718.

[2] For an account of this Synod, see Mather's Magnalia; Hutchinson, 1, 206, &c.

[3] Hutchinson, 1. 206; 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 48.

[4] Mass. Rec's.; Hutchinson, 1. 206.

[5] Hutchinson, 1. 206; Chalmers, Ann., 315.

assuring the people of his "true love and friendship to the country, and that neither in their privileges, charter, government, nor church discipline, should they receive any prejudice."[1] Yet rumors were again rife that commissioners were to be appointed to regulate the affairs of New England, and an Order to that effect was actually issued, though not put into execution until the lapse of a year.[2] CHAP. XIV. 1663. Apr. 10, 1663.

It may not, perhaps, be unworthy of notice in this connection, that, while complaints were instituted against Massachusetts for not admitting to the rights of citizenship those of different sentiments in religion, England was pursuing a similar course, by her severe enactments against non-conformists; and Charles the Second, who had obtained the assistance of the Presbyterians to his restoration, by express and solemn promise of an ecclesiastical constitution framed on a compromise between their principles and those of the Anglican Church, was now unscrupulously violating this engagement, and pressing with extreme rigor the most odious enactments of previous reigns.[3] With what propriety could Cis-Atlantic legislation be condemned, when Trans-Atlantic legislation was so strikingly analogous? The result of these measures, however, was not altogether unfavorable to the colonies, who received a considerable accession of "godly ministers," and would have received more, had not their own situation threatened the loss of their privileges, and that the asylum to which the oppressed were fleeing would be unable to shelter them. Dr. Owen, whose praise was in all the churches, was among those who contemplated a removal to America; and apprized of his intentions, a letter was sent desiring him to accept the invitation of the first church in Boston to become its pastor; but the invitation was declined.[4] Oct. 20, 1663.

[1] Letter, in Bancroft, 2. 77. Comp. also 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 282.

[2] Chalmers, Ann., 386; 4 M. H. Coll. 2. 284.

[3] Burnet's Own Times, 1. 178–86, 193, 204; Hallam, Const. Hist., 422; Grahame, 1. 228.

[4] Hutchinson, 1. 207; Neal; Grahame, 1. 228.

CHAP. XIV. 1663. Meanwhile, the colonists moved steadily on in their course, conceding but little, and resolved to resist all attempts to annul their charter. The Act of Navigation was rather evaded than submitted to, though a seeming compliance with its terms was rendered;[1] but when it became certain that Commissioners were appointed, and had already embarked, and that ships of war would speedily anchor in the harbor of Boston to enforce their instructions, precautionary measures were promptly adopted, and the patent, and a duplicate of the same, were delivered to a committee of four, Bellingham, Leverett, Clark, and Johnson, to be kept safe and secret for the benefit of the country.[2]

May 28, 1664. At the next meeting of the General Court, in anticipation of the arrival of these ships, orders were issued to Mr. Davenport, the Captain of the Castle, to send word to the Governor and Deputy on their first appearance; a committee of two, resident in Boston, was appointed to repair on board, to present the respects of the Court to the chief gentlemen, and acquaint them of the desire of the magistrates, that to prevent collisions, both officers and soldiers should land but in small parties, unarmed, and "behave themselves orderly, and give no offence to the people and laws of the place." The proper entertainment of the Commissioners was also provided for, and preparations were made for receiving them in the best manner.

The next step characterizes the age. A day of fasting and prayer was appointed, to be observed throughout the whole jurisdiction, to "implore the mercy of God upon them under their many distractions and troubles." This

[1] Hutch. Coll.. 383; 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 71. By an order of Oct. 30, 1663, the officers of the commercial ports were directed to enforce the Act of Trade, and it was voted that this order be posted in the port towns, and published with the other laws. Maritime Papers, vol. 1. fols. 2, 4, 5, 6, where are several papers relating to this subject.

[2] Hutchinson, 1. 211; Mass. Rec's.; Bancroft, 2. 77.

was the customary practice on all occasions of importance; and such gatherings were larger then than they have been since. By the law of the land, none but the sick were exempted from attending public worship. Even "the mother took with her the nursling whom she could not leave" at home. The great bulk of the people were at such times convened; and, in lieu of those facilities for the rapid diffusion of intelligence which are the invention of later days, no method could have been devised better calculated to acquaint all with passing events; and the influence of the clergy, which was immeasurable, was brought to bear with wonderful power in instilling into the minds of their auditors the lessons of duty, religion, and liberty.[1]

Four ships, the Guinea, of 36 guns, the Elias, of 30, the Martin, of 16, and the William and Nicholas, of 10, were provided for the conveyance of the Commissioners, which sailed from Portsmouth with about four hundred and fifty regular soldiers, and their officers, having orders to rendezvous at a given port on Long Island, and, after levying upon New England for additional forces, to proceed against the Dutch at New Netherlands, whom the government of England were "determined to reduce to an entire obedience." If conciliation was, as the King professed, the object which he had in view in instituting this commission, he was singularly unfortunate in the selection of the instruments to whom the discharge of its duties was confided. The armament was under the command of Col. Richard Nichols, a gentleman of the bed-chamber to the Duke of York, and an officer of versatile talents, and high respectability, who had served under Marshal Turenne, and who was to be the Deputy Governor of New York after its reduction. With him were associated Sir Robert

[1] Mass. Rec's.; Hutchinson, 1. 210.

CHAP. XIV. 1664. Carr, a violent Royalist, and a man of supercilious deportment, and questionable principles; Col. George Cartwright, "naturally morose, saturnine and suspicious," yet possessing an energy of intellect which qualified him for the discharge of difficult public business; and Samuel Maverick, formerly of Massachusetts, who was a known Episcopalian, and the "professed enemy" of the colony.[1]

These gentlemen were commissioned by the King, to hear and determine "all complaints and appeals in all causes and matters, as well military as criminal and civil," and were to "proceed in all things for the providing for and settling the peace and security of the country, according to their good and sound discretions," and agreeably to the instructions from time to time furnished them.[2] Owing to severe storms, and the occurrence of fogs, the voyage of the fleet was boisterous, and the vessels became separated, three of them being forced to put in at Piscataqua. The Guinea, the principal ship, was the first to arrive, with
July 23. Cols. Nichols and Cartwright; and she appeared before the town on Saturday, "about 5 or 6 of the clock at night." As may well be supposed, the excitement of the people was intense; though outwardly, the demeanor of the magistrates was calm and collected. Nichols and Cartwright at once entered upon business, and requested that the Colonial Council might be convened without delay; and when
July 26. it met, they produced their commission, with the King's letter of April 23d, and that part of their instructions relating to the reduction of the Dutch, and requested assistance for the accomplishment of this object. The Council consented to call a meeting of the General Court on the 3d of August, and lay this request before them; but with this

[1] Hubbard, 577; Grahame, 1. 234; Brodhead's N. Y., 736; Dunlap's N. Y., 1. 115.

[2] Hutchinson, 1. 459; Hazard, 2. 638–9; Hubbard; Trumbull, 1. 522–3; Morton's Mem., 173–6; Baylies, Mem., 2. 55–7; Thompson's Long Island, 119–20.

answer the Commissioners were "not well satisfied;" and informing the Governor and magistrates that there were yet many more things to signify to them, which they would attend to on their return, and commending to them in the meantime a further consideration, and a more definite answer to the King's letter of June 28, 1662, they set out for the New Netherlands, first forwarding a letter to Governor Winthrop, of Connecticut, acquainting him with their arrival, and requesting him to meet them at the west end of Long Island.[1] CHAP. XIV. 1664. July 9.

At the time fixed, the General Court assembled; his Majesty's letters, commissions, and instructions, with the proposals thereupon, were read and "largely debated;" and it was first resolved "to bear faith and true allegiance to his Majesty, and *adhere to their Patent*, so dearly obtained, and so long enjoyed by undoubted right in the sight of God and men;" next it was agreed to raise, at the charge of the colonies, a number of men not exceeding two hundred, to serve against the Dutch; officers were appointed and commissioned, and orders were given to the Treasurer to disburse the necessary funds; and two messengers, Thomas Clark, and John Pynchon, were despatched to the Commissioners to inform them of these proceedings: — but in consequence of the capitulation of the Dutch, the services of the troops seem not to have been required, nor were they probably called upon to take up their march.[2] Aug. 3.

The letter of June 28, came next in order. The demand of the King in itself, perhaps, was not unreasonable; but to comply with that demand was not only to acknowledge the right of his Majesty to interfere in their affairs, it was also to open the door to heretics, and to concede to them a portion of the rights of the faithful. The clergy, how-

[1] Danforth Papers, in 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 92–3.

[2] Danforth Papers, in 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 93–4; Mass. Rec's.; Hubbard, 577, 721; Hutchinson, 1. 212; Chalmers, Ann., 386–7.

CHAP. XIV. 1664. ever, were dexterous pilots, and were equal to the emergency of safely conducting the Puritan ship between Scylla and Charybdis; and it was agreed to modify the old law, by providing that all English subjects, being freeholders, and of a competent estate, *and certified by the ministers of the place to be orthodox in faith*, and not vicious in their lives, should be made freemen, although not members of the church.[1]

As the Commissioners, at their departure from Boston, had not presented his Majesty's "further instructions," directing and limiting them in the exercise of their functions; as some of them had also conducted in a "distasteful" manner, especially Mr. Maverick, who, on landing at Piscataqua, menaced the constable of Portsmouth while in the exercise of his office;[2] and as the minds of the people were filled with a deep sense of the sad events threatening the colonies in case these gentlemen should inforce their power as it was feared they would, an order Sep. 10 was passed prohibiting complaints to them, and it was Oct. 25. resolved forthwith to prepare a new address to the King.[3]

This document is worthy of its origin. With fervid and impressive eloquence it sketches the early history of the colony under the Charter from Charles the First, and the sufferings and privations endured by the emigrants; recites the encouragements which Charles the Second himself had given them, and his assurances of protection; and states what had been done to satisfy him of their loyalty, by complying with his requests so far as was consistent with their Charter. It then notices the conduct of those who had for years sought their overthrow, and had set themselves against them by "misinformations, complaints, and solicitations;" deprecates the commission appointed to interfere,

[1] Hutchinson, 1. 212, and Coll., 418.

[2] Carr's Declaration., in 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 95.

[3] Hutchinson, 1. 460–4; Coll., 422.

as was apprehended, with their rights, by subjecting them to the arbitrary power of strangers, proceeding, not by any established law, but by their own discretion; and though the course of the Commissioners is not specially censured, yet, say they, "we have had enough to confirm us in our fears, that their improvement of this power .... will end in the subversion of our all." CHAP. XIV. 1664.

Under these circumstances, an appeal is made to "put a stop to these proceedings;" "for if they go on," it is added, "your subjects here will either be forced to seek new dwellings, or sink and faint under intolerable burdens. The vigor of all new endeavors will be enfeebled; the good of converting the natives distracted; the inhabitants driven to we know not what extremity; and this hopeful plantation in the issue ruined. It is indeed a grief to our hearts, to see your Majesty put upon this extraordinary cost and charge about a business the product whereof can never reimburse the one half of what will be expended upon it. Imposed rulers and officers will expend more than can be raised here, and the wonted benefit by customs to the Exchequer will be thereby diminished. If the aim is to gratify some particular gentlemen by livings, that will also fail, where nothing is to be had; for such is the poverty of the people, that if, with hard labor, a subsistence is obtained, it is as much as the generality are able to do, paying but small rates towards the public charges; and if all the country ordinarily raises for the charges of government were put together, and then doubled or trebled, it would not be accounted for one such gentleman a considerable accommodation. And if the taking this course should drive the people out of the country — for to a coalition they will never come — it will be hard to find another people that will stay long, seeing it is not a country where men can subsist without hard labor and great frugality. There have been high representations of divisions and dis-

CHAP. XIV. 1664.

contents among us; yet the body of the people are unanimously satisfied in the present government, and abhorrent from change; and that which is now offered will, instead of relieving, raise up such grievances as are intolerable. We suppose there is no government under heaven, wherein some discontented persons may not be found; and if it is a sufficient accusation that there are such, who will be innocent? Yet through the favor of God, there are few among us, and fewer that have cause to be so.

"God knows our greatest ambition is to live a poor and quiet life in a corner of the world, without offence. We came not into this wilderness to seek great things to ourselves; and if any come after us to seek them here, they will be disappointed. We keep ourselves within our line, and meddle not with matters abroad. A just dependence upon, and subjection to your Majesty, according to our charter, it is far from our hearts to disacknowledge. We so highly prize your favorable aspect, as we would gladly do anything, that is within our power, to purchase the continuance of it. We are carefully studious of all due subjection to your Majesty, and that not only for wrath, but for conscience sake. And should Divine Providence ever offer an opportunity, wherein we might, in any righteous way, according to our poor and mean capacity, testify our dutiful affection to your Majesty, we hope we should most gladly embrace it. But it is a great unhappiness to have no other testimony of our loyalty offered, but to destroy our being, which nature teaches us to preserve, or to yield up our liberties, which are far dearer to us than our lives, and which had we feared being deprived of, we had never wandered from our fathers' homes into these ends of the earth, nor laid our labors and estates therein.

"Royal Sir, it is in your power to say of your poor people in New England, they shall not die. Let our government live, let our patent live, our magistrates live, our

laws and liberties live, our religious enjoyments live, so shall we all yet have further cause to say, from our hearts, let the King live forever: and the blessings of them that were ready to perish shall come upon your Majesty. CHAP. XIV. 1664.

"It was Job's excellency, when he sat as king among his people, that he was a father to the poor. They are a poor people, destitute of outward favor, wealth and power, who now cry unto their Lord the King. May your Majesty please to regard their cause and maintain their right: it will stand among the works of lasting honor, to after generations; and we and ours shall have hearty cause to rejoice, that we have been numbered among your Majesty's most humble servants and suppliants."

With this address, letters were sent to Robert Boyle, President of the Society for Propagating the Gospel, and to the Earls of Clarendon and Manchester, two of the most influential noblemen of the realm; but neither met with a favorable reception, the King being "displeased with their petition," and Boyle and Clarendon both expressing their amazement that a "revocation of the commission should be demanded, without charging the Commissioners with the least matter of crimes or exorbitances."[1]

Meanwhile, extravagant rumors continued to be circulated, and the sparks of excitement were fanned into a flame. Portentous signs were seen in the skies, and the appearance of a bearded comet was regarded as an omen of ill.[2] It was alleged by some, that the commission of the King was a forgery, and was "made under an old hedge."[3] Mr. Whiting, who happened to be at Boston when the Commissioners arrived, hastened home to give information of their extraordinary powers, and to commu-

[1] Hutch. Coll., 388–92, 464–5; 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 49; Chalmers, Ann., 387–8.

[2] Morton's Mem., 170; Hutchinson, 1. 207.

[3] Danforth, in 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 56; Bishop's N. E. Judged, 349.

CHAP. XIV. 1664.

nicate the apprehensions entertained by Massachusetts[1] A report was raised that the latter colony was to be taxed £5000 yearly for the King's use, and that 12d. per annum was to be assessed on all improved lands;[2] Major Hathorne, a man of "quick apprehension, and voluble speech,"[3] at the head of his troops made a "seditious speech" against the step; and Governor Endicott, a faithful sentinel upon the watch-towers of his country, the last sands of whose life were fast running out, and who had been a tried friend of the colony, though hated by the Monarch, delivered a similar speech "in their meeting house in Boston."[4] As an act of self-defense, it was resolved to attempt wearying both the King and the Commissioners by protracted delays. "Seven years," it was urged, "can easily be spun out in this way, and before that time a change may come." Besides, "who knows," suggested others, "what the event of this Dutch War will be?"[5] There was certainly no disposition to facilitate the business on which these gentlemen had come. The commission itself was condemned as contrary to the Charter; and eminent jurists have since sustained this decision.[6]

Feb. 15, 1664-5.

The Dutch being reduced, three of the four Commissioners returned to Boston.[7] But they had seen too much of the spirit of the people on their first visit, to anticipate a remarkably cordial reception, or to look for a prompt compliance with their extravagant demands. Hence they adopted the policy of visiting the other colonies first, hoping their submission would intimidate Massachusetts, and abate her refractoriness which was "very much feared."[8] Before leaving for Plymouth, however, a meeting was held

[1] Hubbard, 721.
[2] Danforth Papers, in 2. M. H. Coll., 8. 56.
[3] Johnson, in 2. M. H. Coll., 4. 24.
[4] Hutchinson.
[5] Hutch. Coll., 417, 420.
[6] Hutchinson, 1. 235; 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 67; Chalmers, Ann., 388; Bancroft, 2. 83.
[7] Danforth Papers, in 2. M. H. Coll., 8. 95.
[8] Hutch. Coll., 417.

at the Governor's house, and the request was made that all the inhabitants should be ordered to assemble on the next election day, and that persons should be appointed to show them the bounds of the Patent. With the latter proposition the magistrates readily complied; but the former was so preposterous that it was unhesitatingly rejected. It was urged, that it would be a detriment to the country to take all from their business, and that, during their absence, the lives of their families might be endangered. The people, it was said, were at liberty to assemble if they chose; there was no prohibition preventing them; but to require it they should not. "The request is reasonable," was the insolent reply of Cartwright, "and he that opposes it is a traitor." But finding the magistrates firm, letters were sent on their own responsibility to several non-freemen inviting them to meet, and the Commissioners departed.[1]

On reaching Plymouth, they presented to the General Court the King's letter of April 23, 1664, and a paper of "Propositions," relating principally to the Oath of Allegiance, and the rights of citizenship.[2] It indicates the peaceableness of this colony, that but one complaint was entered against it — that the Governor, Mr. Prince, had debarred an individual from enjoying a farm four miles square, which he had purchased of an Indian — and this was easily settled. At the request of the Commissioners, the Patent of the Colony was produced, and a copy of it furnished; but the people were too poor to pay for a charter from the King. "We will renew it at our own charge," was the insidious reply, "if you will suffer his Majesty to choose your Governor."[3] But the Court, "with many thanks to the Commissioners, and great protestations of

Feb. 22.

[1] Danforth Papers, in 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 56, 95-6.

[2] Hutchinson, 1. 212, note. The letter to Gov. Prince, dated Feb. 7, and signed by three of the commissioners, is among the Winslow MSS., deposited with Charles Deane, Esq.

[3] Hutch. Coll., 417.

CHAP. XIV. 1665.

loyalty to the King, chose to be as they were." Plymouth was not to be bribed to surrender her liberties. The Commissioners found little here to tempt their cupidity. The colony contained but twelve towns, one saw mill for boards, and one bloomery for iron; it had neither good rivers nor good harbors; and the people were so few that they were unable "to maintain scollers to their ministers, but were necessitated to make use of a guifted brother in some places."[1]

In Rhode Island and Connecticut, the Commissioners met with better success; and, after settling the bounds of those Colonies, and other questions in dispute, they returned to

April. Massachusetts, "privately and separately." Here, being joined by Col. Nichols, from New York, the day previous

May 2. to the annual election they delivered five papers or propositions to the Deputy Governor, — Mr. Endicott, the Gov-

May 3. ernor, having deceased during their absence. The election proceeded quietly, the people firmly sustaining the government. Mr. Bellingham, the inflexible supporter of their civil and political rights, was chosen to succeed Mr. Endicott as Governor, and Mr. Willoughby, the resolute champion of democratic liberty, took his place in the office of Deputy Governor.[2]

May 4. The next day the propositions were presented to the Court, and the Commissioners were requested to communicate all his Majesty's instructions, that they might be considered at once; but this was refused. Only a partial reply to their propositions was therefore returned, "reserving liberty to enlarge upon the particulars." The debate between the parties was continued several days. The politicians of Massachusetts were more than a match for his

[1] Hutch. Coll., 417. — Yet the King approved the behavior of Plymouth. Hutchinson, 1. 232; Baylies, 2. 58–9.

[2] Hubbard, 722–6; Hutchinson, 1. 215; and Coll., 412; 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 52. Mr. Bellingham continued in office until his decease, in 1672.

Majesty's Commissioners; papers passed to and fro; and the discussion was animated and somewhat exciting. The government held it to be "insufferable that the colony should be brought to the bar of a tribunal unknown to its charter;" and, as but little progress was made, the Commissioners, foiled in their movements, and wearied with the altercation, propounded the question, to which a positive answer was peremptorily demanded: — "Do you acknowledge his Majesty's Commission to be of full force, to all the intents and purposes therein contained?" To this question no definite reply was returned; — the Court chose to plead the charter.[1] CHAP. XIV. 1665. May 18.

At length the Commissioners concluded to take more decided ground, and an order was issued to Joshua Scottow, a merchant of Boston, requiring his presence at the house of Capt. Breeden the next day, to answer to the charges of Thomas Deane, and others. At the time fixed, the Commissioners prepared for the trial; when, by order of the Governor, a herald stepped forth in the name of the King, and, sounding his trumpet, formally forbade any abetting the Commissioners; to give greater publicity to this act the proclamation was repeated in three several places; and the Court, satisfied that it had discharged its duty, calmly awaited the result. The Commissioners were amazed. The conduct of the magistrates was to them inexplicable. Without doubt the authority under which they acted, was, in their eyes, unquestionable. Yet that authority was repudiated, and its assertors defied. It was useless to contend longer. "Since you will misconstrue our endeavors," was their final reply, "we shall not lose more of our labor upon you;" and, after a fruitless attempt to revise the laws of the Colony, they retreated to the North. Here, however, their interference was resisted by Massachusetts; May 23. May 24.

[1] Danforth Papers, in 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 59-81; Hutchinson, 1. 217-24.

CHAP. XIV. 1665. and, as the towns of New Hampshire had submitted to the jurisdiction of that colony, all resident upon the Piscataqua were forbidden upon their peril in anything to obey the Commissioners of his Majesty.[1]

The conduct of Col. Nichols, in all these proceedings, was discreet and respectful; that of Cartwright and Carr was severely reprehended; and Maverick was regarded as an undisguised enemy. The Commissioners did not immediately return to England. Some time elapsed before they took their departure. In this interval, they busied themselves in collecting all the circumstances against the country they could, and the papers containing the same were committed to Cartwright; but, fortunately, on his passage he fell into the hands of the Dutch, and was stripped of everything. "By this providence" much evil was doubtless prevented; and it was a subject of not unnatural gratulation to the colonists, that the designs of their adversaries had been so signally defeated.[2]

And what said King Charles to this treatment of his Commissioners? It was simply resolved that the scene of
Apr. 10, 1666. negotiation should be transferred to England; Bellingham and Hathorne were specially named as two of the five persons to be sent over as agents for the colony to speak in its behalf; and they were commanded upon their allegiance
Sept. 6. not to fail in their appearance. On the 6th of September, Samuel Maverick, the most obnoxious of the former Commissioners, appeared in Boston, and delivered to the Governor and Magistrates "a writing, without direction or seal," which proved to be the letter of April 10; and, though suspicions of the authority of the document were
Sep. 11. openly avowed, a Court was convened for its consideration. The letter was certainly of a character to awaken appre-

[1] Hutchinson, 1. 227–8, 234, and Coll. 419; Belknap's N. H. 1. 106–112.

[2] Hutchinson, 1. 229, 233; Coll., 411.

hension. Should they submit to its demands, or treat it with neglect? The forenoon of the second day was spent in prayer. The most eminent clergymen of the colony were present; Wilson of Boston, Mather of Dorchester, Symmes of Charlestown, Whiting of Lynn, Cobbett of Ipswich, and Mitchell of Cambridge. On the following day a "lecture" was delivered; and the elders being convened with the Court, a debate ensued "concerning the duty we owe to his Majesty in reference to his signification."[1] CHAP. XIV. Sep. 12, 1666. Sep. 13.

The news that an affair of such consequence was pending, could not be prevented from spreading in every direction; petitions began to pour in from several of the largest towns,—Boston, Salem, Newbury, and Ipswich,—advising compliance with his Majesty's demand;[2] and a series of verses, sarcastically describing "a Nonconformist's Oath," was drawn up, circulated, and sent to England.[3] The debate which ensued was excited and animating. It was too serious a time for political gasconade, and the speeches of the deputies were brief and laconic. "Let some way be propounded," said the intrepid Bellingham, "that the offence which the King has conceived may come to a legal issue." "Process in courts of law," suggested the moderate Bradstreet, "cannot reach us in ordinary course; yet the prerogative of the King gives him power to command our appearance, and we are bound to obey." "The King's demands pass everywhere," cried Dudley: "You may have a legal trial if you desire, and you may insist upon and claim it." "But," urged Willoughby, "does not God call us to argue one way as well as another? If this be allowed, how easily may the King, in one year, undo all. We must as well consider God's displeasure as the King's; the in-

[1] Hutchinson, 1.; Chalmers, Ann., 390.

[2] Danforth Papers, in 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 103–8; 3 M. H. Coll., 1. 59–60.

[3] These curious verses may be seen in 2 M. H. Coll., 4. 104–6.

CHAP. XIV. 1666.

terests of ourselves and God's things, as his Majesty's prerogative: for our liberties are of concernment, and to be regarded as to the preservation. If the King may send for me now, and another to-morrow, we are a miserable people." "Yet," insinuated Dudley, "prerogative is as necessary as law, and is for the good of the whole. And where there is a right of power, it will be abused, so long as it is in the hands of weak men; and the less pious, the more apt to miscarry; but right may not be denied because it may be abused." "That is the point in dispute," was the rejoinder of Hathorne: "This age hath brought forth many treatises about prerogative, and do affirm, that prerogative is not above law, but limited by it; and the law states in what cases prerogative is to take place." Thus the debate continued; and, after much argument, obedience was refused. "We have already" — such was the reply of the Court — "furnished our views in writing, so that the ablest persons among us could not declare our course more fully."[1]

Yet the loyalty of the colonists did not expend itself in empty professions. As the conquest of Canada was then a favorite project of Charles, privateers were fitted out to aid in its reduction.[2] Provisions were likewise sent to the fleet in the West Indies.[3] Money was contributed for the benefit of the sufferers by the great fire in London.[4] And a ship-load of masts was forwarded for his Majesty's navy: "a blessing mighty unexpected," says Pepys, "and but for which we must have failed the next year."[5] Thus ended

[1] Danforth Papers, in 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 98–100, 110.

[2] Danforth Papers, in 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 109; Hutchinson, 1. 235; Hubbard. 730.

[3] Hutchinson, 1. 236.

[4] Chalmers, Ann., 412; Hubbard, 728, 731.

[5] Danforth Papers, in 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 110; Pepys, 1. 489; Hutchinson, 1. 235; Bancroft, 2. 89. See also Maritime Papers, vol. 1. fol's. 52, 53. These masts were sent in 1668. In 1671, John Gillam asked permission to get masts for his Majesty's use as usual. Ibid., fol. 57. Some orders were passed on this subject as early as 1665. Ibid., fol. 51.

for a season the contest with the Crown. The defiance of Massachusetts was followed by no immediate danger. The calamities which England had suffered at home, by the prevalence of the plague, and a devouring fire, had humbled her pride; Clarendon, the chief minister, had been displaced, and was in exile, and the profligate Buckingham had been advanced to his post; and, while the leisure of the Monarch was principally spent in dallying with women, and the whole court was converted into a gigantic brothel, and the nation itself was disturbed with the apprehension of deep-laid designs to subvert its own constitution, the Puritans of Massachusetts managed their affairs without molestation. The ministry had no courage to interfere in their concerns. The morality of the colonists was a perpetual rebuke upon their own debauchery: they were no fawning parasites, pampering the passions of a profligate prince; and before the stern spirit of liberty, which throbbed high in every heart, both the Monarch and his courtiers timidly quailed.[1]

[1] Hutchinson, 1. 230, 235, 246.

CHAPTER XV.

PHILIP'S WAR—1675.

CHAP. XV. 1620 to 1675.

At the settlement of Massachusetts, the Narragansets, next to the Pequots, were the most powerful and warlike Indian tribe in New England. Before the desolations of the plague, they could muster, probably, five thousand warriors, and numbered, in all, about eighteen thousand souls. Under the government of Canonicus and Miantonomo, and Ninigret, the sachem of Niantick, a member of the same tribe, some difficulties had arisen with them, and they had strenuously resisted all efforts for their conversion from the religion of their fathers; but now, under Pessacus and Ninigret, they were but the wreck of their former greatness, and the different tribes within their jurisdiction numbered about two thousand warriors, and seven thousand souls.[1] The Wampanoags had also resisted all attempts to convert them to Christianity, though under Massasoit and Alexander they continued in friendship with the English, and the league of 1621, was kept inviolable. They were now governed by Philip, whose residence was at Mount Hope, and who was able to muster about seven hundred warriors.[2]

The dealings of the colonists with the Indians has long been a subject of vague reproach. Their treatment of the red race has been censured as cruel and barbarous; and the conduct of Penn has been alluded to in contrast. We see no reason to think, however, that the governors of

[1] Hubbard, 139; Gookin, in 1 M. H. Coll., vol. 1.

[2] Hubbard's Narr., 8.

the colonies were Neros and Caligulas, — men above all others eminently wicked. Nor were the magistrates or the people a signally barbarous and blood-thirsty race. Their situation was at once both critical and perplexing. They had no disposition to injure the natives, or to treat them with harshness. They purchased of them the lands they occupied, and never, save in one instance — during the Pequot War — forcibly possessed themselves of a single foot of ground.[1] Yet, when barbarism and civilization are brought into contact, one or the other must eventually yield. And especially, when the war-like spirit of the savages of New England is considered in connection with the sternness of the Puritan temper, it is evident that two races so essentially different could not long co-exist without frequent collisions. It is not, however, our purpose to apologize for our fathers. They need no apology. We admit that they erred, judged by our standard, and by the light of the present age; but compared with their contemporaries, in the Old World or the New, their conduct was as consistent, and their characters were as pure.

From the moment of the landing of the English on these shores, the doom of the Indian seems to have been sealed. Unaccustomed to the habits of civilized life, everything he saw was strange and surprising. He felt that the new comers were vastly his superiors; and, as the population increased, and new towns were settled, and his hunting grounds were occupied for purposes of cultivation, although he had alienated these tracts under his own hand and seal, he felt painfully the contrast with the time when all was his own, and he roamed unchecked over the fairest regions, and pursued unmolested the chase of the deer.

Hemmed in by rivals whose power he dreaded, his proud spirit chafed under so galling a bondage, and he sighed for

[1] Hubbard, Narr., 13; Higginson, in Inter. Charter Papers, 1. 145.

CHAP. XV. 1620 to 1675.

the freedom of his earlier years. The rude bow and arrow, once his principal weapons, had been exchanged for the musket of the white man; and in the use of this weapon he had acquired such skill as to be a formidable antagonist, and flattered himself that he was able, with the assistance of his neighbors, to drive before him as the winds the leaves of the autumnal forests, those who had become to him objects of hatred and deadly revenge. The leading warriors of the different tribes were wise enough to see that there was danger of their own extermination, unless the pale-face was expelled from the country; and Philip of Mount Hope was the first to awaken to a sense of this danger, and the first to propose an alliance to prevent it.

1670-1. It was in 1670–1, that suspicions of the intentions of Philip began to be excited; and, by the frequent gathering of his tribe, repairing their arms, grinding their hatchets, and insulting the English, he was conceived to be med-

1662. itating a general war. Eight years previous, he had promised, at Plymouth, to continue in friendship with the English, and to remain faithful to the King and the colony.[1] These professions were believed; but now it was rumored that he was about to violate them. Restless under restraints which had long been imposed upon him, it needed but little to goad him to action; and, as he was careless in his own carriage, his conduct was imitated by others of inferior rank, and several murders were wantonly committed.[2]

The people of Plymouth were aroused by these abuses; and, sending to Philip to demand redress, they invoked aid from Massachusetts to reduce him to submission. The magistrates of the latter colony, anxious to prevent hostilities, despatched messengers to mediate between the contending parties; and a meeting for that purpose was held at Taunton. The interview took place in the church of the vil-

[1] Morton's Mem., 160–1; Hubbard's Narr., 10; Hutchinson, 1. 253.

[2] Hubbard's Narr., 7; N. E. Gen. Reg., 8. 328.

lage; and the scene there presented was one of the most singular ever witnessed in those parts. On the one side were the English, clad in the distinguishing garb of their day, with solemn faces and close shorn hair; and on the other were the Indians, in the loose dress of their country, adorned with wampum, and all the finery in which savages delight, with their long black hair hanging down their backs, and their small sunken eyes gleaming like coals. Philip promptly denied harboring hostile intentions; but when questioned as to the object of his warlike preparations, he endeavored to represent them as designed for defense against the Narragansets. The Commissioners, who knew upon what terms he stood with that tribe, and who were satisfied that the supplies he had obtained, of arms and ammunition, were designed for an attack upon Taunton and other villages, charged him with this purpose, and with such effect, that in his confusion he acknowledged all, and signed a paper renewing his covenant with his "ancient friends," and freely engaging to resign to the government of Plymouth all his English arms as pledges of his fidelity.[1] CHAP. XV. 1670-1. Apr. 10, 1671.

A bond obtained under such circumstances was not worth the paper upon which it was written, and, when Philip was at liberty, he spurned his engagement; no more arms were delivered up; and he refused to appear at Plymouth when summoned. The arms formerly surrendered were accordingly declared forfeit; Mr. Morton, the Secretary of the colony, wrote the governments of Massachusetts and Rhode Island informing them of the conduct of Philip, and of a new summons for his appearance on the 13th of September, which, if refused, they were resolved to enforce at the point of the sword.[2] By the invitation of Mr. Eliot, Philip May 27, June. Aug. 23.

[1] Hubbard's Narr., 11–12; Mather, Post., 7; Hutchinson, 1. 254–6; Baylies, 3. 18–21. Other Indians subsequently submitted to the English. 1 M. H. Coll., 5. 193–7, and 6. 196.

[2] 1 M. H. Coll., 6. 197–8; Drake's Indians, B. 3. 21. The Summons of May 27, is among the Winslow MSS., deposited with Charles Deane, Esq.

CHAP. XV. 1671. was at Boston at the time this letter arrived;[1] and he represented his cause so favorably to the magistrates, and so artfully insinuated that his engagements to Plymouth were only for "amity and not for subjection," that, in their reply, they expressed doubts of the power of that colony over him, and advised the reference of all disputes to the commissioners of Massachusetts and Connecticut. After Sep. 24 some delay this advice was accepted; the mediators met, and matters seemed fully accommodated. Philip, the "peccant offending party," signed a second paper, acknowledging his subjection to the king of England and the government of Plymouth, and promised to pay £100 tribute in three years, if able, and five wolves heads annually, if he could obtain them; to abstain from war without consent; and in case of future difficulties to endeavor to rectify the same, and to dispose of his lands only with the consent of the colonial government.[2]

1671 to 1674. From this pacification, for three years, no special disturbance occurred, and the colonists flattered themselves that the designs of the savage monarch were wholly abandoned. But this calm was deceitful; for, while everything was apparently quiet, Philip was maturing his plans, rallying his forces, and preparing for war. The reality of this plot we are aware has been doubted; but the proofs of its existence we do not feel at liberty wholly to reject.[3] Its execution was fixed for the spring of 1676; but, as some say, by the rashness of Philip's young men, and against his own judgment and that of his counsellors, it was precipitated a year earlier, and so suddenly that, when the first blood was shed, the chieftain of Mount Hope is reported to have wept; and "many of the Indians were in a maze,

[1] 1 M. H. Coll., 6. 198.

[2] Hubbard, Narr., 144; Mather, Post., 4; Hutchinson, 1. 256-8; Plym. Col. Rec's.; N. E. Gen. Reg., 8, 328.

[3] Hubbard, Narr., 13-14; Hutchinson, 1. 259; Staples, Ann. Prov., 159; Drake's Boston, 398.

not knowing well what to do;" but eventually, they were all mustered under Philip, and continued to aid him until the war ended.[1] CHAP. XV. 1675.

The proximate cause of the outbreak of hostilities, was the murder of one Sausaman, of the Massachusetts tribe, who had been converted to Christianity, and employed as a teacher at Natick; but who subsequently apostatized, joined Philip, and became his principal counsellor and Secretary.[2] By the exertions of Mr. Eliot he was reclaimed; and, while at Middleborough, he learned of the preparations Philip was making, and reported them to Plymouth.[3] Soon he was missing; and search being made, his body was found under the ice[4] in a pond in Middleborough, under such circumstances as to leave no doubt that he had been assassinated. Immediate inquiries were made for the perpetrators of the deed; and upon the representation of an Indian who had witnessed the murder, three of Philip's men were seized, taken to Plymouth, tried by a jury, part of whom were Indians, condemned and executed.[5] June.

Both pending, and after this trial, letters were received from Mr. Brown, of Swanzey, and others, stating that Philip's warriors were in arms; that messengers from different tribes had met at Mount Hope, and joined in the war dance; that the young men were "much set against the English;" and that their families had been sent to the Narragansets for protection;[6] but the only notice taken of these rumors, was to forbid the loan of arms to the natives, Jun. 11.

[1] Hubbard, 14; Callender, in 4 R. I. Hist. Coll.; Belknap's N. H., 1. 130–1.

[2] Letters written by him while in the employ of Philip, are said to be in existence. Drake's Boston. His full name was Wusausamon.

[3] Philip and others were examined after this report was made; but no legal evidence was produced against them. Hubbard, 15.

[4] Not in a *field*, as in Grahame, 1. 240.

[5] Hubbard, 14–16; Mather, Magnalia, b. vii. c. vi. s. 5; Hutchinson, 1. 260–1.

[6] MS. Lett. of Brown to Gov. Winslow, dated June 11, in the Winslow MSS.; Hubbard, 16; Mather, Post., 5.

CHAP. XV. and to establish a watch at Swanzey and Rehoboth. Yet an "amicable" letter was sent to Philip, and another to
Jun. 15, 1675. "Wutamoo and Ben her husband," to dissuade them from hostilities; but the messenger, Mr. Brown, who delivered the former communication, was roughly received, and barely escaped with his life.[1]

Nearly at the same time, Mr. Benjamin Church, the most famous partisan warrior, perhaps, that Massachusetts pro-
Jun. 17. duced, arrived at Plymouth, and confirmed former reports of the conduct of Philip.[2] The magistrates could no longer
Jun. 20. doubt his intentions; and the very next Sunday, Philip's men made an attack upon Swanzey, about noon, and rifled a few houses; but no blood was shed by the Indians, as they had been strictly commanded not to fire the first gun, and it was superstitiously believed that the party which
Jun. 20. first shed blood would surely be defeated.[3] Forthwith a post was sent to Plymouth for aid, who arrived at "break
Jun. 21. of day," and immediately returned through Bridgewater, with an order that twenty horsemen should be raised to accompany him to Swanzey; information of the attack was sent to Boston, and aid solicited; orders were issued to the captains of all the companies in the Plymouth colony to march without delay; Capt. Bradford, with his men, accompanied by Mr. Church, set out for Taunton, where they were to rendezvous that night; and the seventeen horsemen raised at Bridgewater, on reaching Swanzey, were sent on to Bourne's garrison, a few miles distant, and near the entrance to Mount Hope Neck.[4]

[1] MS. Lett. of Gov. Winslow, in the Winslow MSS.; Hubbard, 16–17; Mather, Post., 5; Life Church, 9; Drake's Boston, 399.

[2] Life of Church, 6–10, ed. 1772.

[3] Callender, in R. I. H. Coll., 4. 127; Hutchinson, 1. 261.

[4] Life Church, 10; I. Mather, Post.. 6; Present State of N. E.; Hubbard, 69. Gov. Winslow, in a MS. letter of June 21, Military Doc'ts., vol. 1. fol. 202, Mass. Ar., says: "I have ordered seventy men to march this day from Taunton and Bridgewater, for the first relief, and hope to have one hundred and fifty more on a march to-morrow;" and in another letter, ibid., fol. 205, dated June 22, he says the Council at Plymouth had agreed to send one hundred foot and fifty horse to Swanzey.

Philip, in the meantime, finding his strength constantly increasing, and taking advantage of the fact that, in the recent attack upon Swanzey, an Englishman had been provoked to fire upon the assailants, — thus shedding the first blood, — made a second attack upon that town four days after, which was observed, by appointment, as a day of fasting and prayer,[1] and, as the people were returning from meeting in the afternoon, one was killed, and others were wounded; two men were killed who were sent for a surgeon; and near Bourne's garrison, six more were murdered, upon whose bodies the savages "exercised more than brutish barbarities, beheading, dismembering, and mangling them, and exposing them in the most inhuman manner; which gashed and ghastly objects struck a damp on all beholders."[2]

CHAP. XV. 1675. Jun. 24

The forces from Plymouth, under Major Cudworth, had by this time reached Swanzey; and here, a few days after, they were joined by the troops from Massachusetts, under Capt. Daniel Henchman, the commander of a foot company, and Capt. Thomas Prentice, the commander of a troop of horse, who left Boston late in the afternoon of the 26th, and reached Woodcock's on the morning of the 27th. Here they were reinforced by a company of volunteers under Capt. Moseley, and marched on to Swanzey, where they were stationed principally at Miles's garrison. Immediately upon their arrival, a scouting party of twelve horsemen, eager for action, and disregarding the advice of their companions, set out to reconnoitre; but at a short distance from the garrison, they were ambushed, and in the skirmish which ensued, William Hammond was killed,

Jun. 28.

[1] Proclamation in Bliss's Rehoboth, 79.

[2] Military Doc'ts., Mass. Ar., vol. 1. fols. 203, 209, 210; Life Church, 11; Hubbard, 69, with 16, and 132; I. Mather, Post., 6; C. Mather, Magnalia, b. vii. c. vi. s. 6; 1. M. H. Coll., 6. 86-7.

CHAP. XV. 1675. Quarter Master Gill was struck by a spent ball, and Col. Belcher was wounded, and his horse shot under him.[1]

For some time the minds of the people had been appalled by the anticipated horrors of this war; and the prevailing and general superstition of the age lent its powerful aid to deepen the gloomy impressions excited. As the troops Jun. 26. from Boston marched on to Woodcock's, an eclipse of the moon occurred; and imagination painted distinctly upon its obscured disc an Indian scalp.[2] Others had seen the form of an Indian bow in the clouds.[3] And others remembered that some years before, in a still, clear day, the report of a gun had been heard in the air, followed by a volley of musketry, and the noise of bullets whistling over their heads; and that troops of horses had been heard coursing in the sky.[4] Upon such "prodigies" great stress was laid; and it would probably have been deemed blasphemy to have suggested, that these sounds were but the sighing of the winds, or the howling of wolves, or perhaps some electrical phenomena equally natural. Yet there were actual dangers encompassing their path. The ambuscade of the 28th, was a lesson to the troops, teaching them that the war, on the part of the Indians, was to be conducted chiefly by surprises, cutting off stragglers, falling upon the unprotected, and overpowering small parties in

[1] Hubbard, 18; Life of Church, 11; Mather, Mag., b. vii. c. vi. s. 6; Hutchinson, I. 262; Bliss, 85; MS. Lett. of Gov. Winslow to Capt. Freeman, dated June 28, in the Winslow MSS.—Maj. Cudworth, in a MS. Lett., Mass. Ar., Military Doc'ts., vol. 1. fol. 203, says he reached Seekonk about the middle of the day, June 24, with eighty men; and understanding the great preparations of the Indians, who were said to number six or seven hundred, he asks two hundred men from Mass. to assist him. For the proceedings of the Council of Mass., see ibid., 204, 206, 207, 208. In the letters of Mass. to Ct., ibid., 209, 210, an account is given of attacks of the Indians on the 24th, 25th, and 26th; and they say: "We have sent about three hundred foot, and eighty horse to help."

[2] Hubbard, 17–18.

[3] Hubbard, 18; Mather, 34.

[4] I. Mather, 34, and C. Mather, Magnalia, b. vii. c. vi. s. 6.

their unguarded marches. But, undaunted by these perils, a second sortie was made, in which the gallant Savage, a youth of twenty, received a flesh wound in his thigh as he "boldly held up his colors in the front of his company." The pursuit was fruitless. The Indians fled to a swamp, skulking behind rocks, and lurking in the bushes, and from these retreats firing upon their assailants. The inclemency of the weather hastened the retreat; and the same evening Maj. Savage arrived from Boston, with sixty horse and as many foot.[1] CHAP. XV. Jun. 29. 1675.

The next day the whole army marched to the head quarters of Philip, passing, on their way, smoking ruins, scattered Bibles, and mangled corpses; but on reaching their place of destination, the wigwams of the savages were found deserted. Even that of the chieftain was no longer occupied. Not one of the enemy was visible. They had crossed Taunton river, and were now upon its eastern banks, in the swamps of Pocasset. The Plymouth forces accordingly passed over to Rhode Island, and those from Massachusetts, after a night spent in the rain, returned to Swanzey.[2] Jun. 30. July 1.

Meanwhile orders were given to Major Gookin, of Cambridge, to raise a company of Praying Indians for the war; and despatching messengers to all the towns, in a few days fifty-two men were mustered, placed under Capt. Johnson, of Roxbury, and marched to Swanzey.[3] Previous to their arrival, a new search was made for Philip and his tribe, and the Massachusetts troops scoured, unsuccessfully, the country around Swanzey. At their return, Capt. Edward Hutchinson arrived, bearing orders from the General Court to proceed to Narraganset, to detach the tribes in that region from the service of Philip. July 2. July 4.

[1] Hubbard, 18–19; Life of Church, 12.

[2] Hubbard, 19, 20; MS. Lett. of Gov. Winslow to Capt. Cudworth, dated July 6, in the Winslow MSS.

[3] MS. Lett. of Jno. Freeman to Gov. Winslow; Drake's Boston, 404.

CHAP. XV. 1675. The Plymouth troops, under Maj. Cudworth, had by this time returned to Swanzey, after leaving a garrison at Mount Hope to fortify the place; and the Massachusetts troops, under Major Savage, marched to the Narraganset country, and being joined there by Commissioners from July 15. Connecticut, a treaty was concluded at the point of the sword, signed by four persons as attorneys for the six principal sachems, and hostages were delivered as a pledge of July 17. fidelity.[1] The troops then returned to Taunton; and, hearing that Philip was in a swamp at Pocasset, and that a portion of the Plymouth troops, under the gallant Church, July 19. had been sent to search for him, on the following Monday[2] the whole army marched, and reaching the swamp in which he was concealed, they resolutely entered, and commenced the attack. Above a hundred wigwams, of green bark, covering about four acres of ground, were found deserted by all save one old man. The Indians had withdrawn deeper into the swamp. The English followed, but in disorder, and firing at random at the quaking of every bush, many of their own men were shot. What number of the

[1] Hubbard, 20–3; Hutchinson, 1. 263–4; Drake's Boston, 405. Among the Winslow MSS., deposited with Chas. Deane, Esq., are several letters relating to this treaty. One, from Gov. Leverett to Gov. Winslow, dated Boston, July 17, speaks of the return of the troops to Swanzey, and of Capt. Hutchinson to Boston the night previous, with two of the hostages. Another, from John Freeman to Gov. Winslow, dated July 18, speaks of the return of Maj. Savage, Capt. Prentice, and Capt. Page, with their troops, to Taunton the evening before. A third, from Gov. Winslow to Gov. Leverett, dated July 18, advises that one hundred men from Mass. be sent to range towards Pocasset, and alludes to the attack upon Dartmouth. A fourth, from Gov. Winslow to Capt. Cudworth, of the same date, speaks of the treaty, and of quitting the garrison at Mt. Hope, and sending home part of his men. And a fifth, from Capt. Cudworth to Gov. Winslow, previous to the negotiation, speaks of the intention of prosecuting it, and of the arrival of Roger Williams, with news from that quarter. All these letters are valuable, and are worthy of publication.

[2] Life of Church, 14–21; MS. Lett. of Jno, Freeman to Gov. Winslow, of July 18; Cudworth's Lett. to Gov. Winslow, in 1 M. H. Coll., 6. 84. — Hubbard, 23–6, and most others say this attack was made on the 18th; but the 18th was Sunday. The dates in Hubbard all through this month are confused, and often erroneous.

savages were slain is uncertain. Probably but few, as their position was secure. Night coming on, the besiegers retreated. The attempt was a failure, and the more unfortunate, because, as they afterwards learned, Philip was in such distress that, had they followed him half an hour longer, he would have been compelled to surrender, and the war would have ended.[1] 1675.

The tactics of the English were now changed; and a garrison being left at Mount Hope, a fort was built and manned at Pocasset; and with a few troops concentrated upon the most exposed places, the rest, after the departure of the Massachusetts troops, save those under Capt. Henchman, were resolved into a flying army, ready at a moment's warning to march wherever required, to hold the enemy in check, and prevent further depredations.[2]

A few days later, a party of Mohegans, under Uncas, July 26.
came to Boston to fight against Philip; and a few English and Praying Indians being added to the company, they were sent by the way of Plymouth to the enemy's country. Had it not been for this circuitous route, they would probably have reached Seekonk in season to meet Philip on his retreat from Pocasset, whence he fled on the night of the last of July, and a complete victory might have ensued. Some time, therefore, was lost in sending for aid, and in rallying, after Philip was discovered on Seekonk Plain; but an engagement took place, in which the people of Aug. 1
Rehoboth, headed by their minister, Mr. Newman, rendered efficient aid. Many of the best of the Mount Hope war-

[1] Hubbard, 26; Hutchinson, 1. 265, and 267, note.

[2] MS. Lett. of Gov. Winslow to Capt. Cudworth, dated July 6, in the Winslow MSS.; Cudworth, in 1. M. H. Coll., 6. 85; Life of Church, 13; Hubbard, 27. Another MS. Lett. of Capt. Thomas to Gov. Winslow, dated Mt. Hope Neck, Aug. 11, speaks of the erection of a fort at that place seventy feet square, by Capt. Henchman, and advises maintaining a flying army. This fort was probably called Fort Leverett, as I find a letter from Capt. Henchman dated July 31, "from Fort Leverett." Military Papers, 1. 232.

CHAP. XV. 1675.

riors were slain, and all might have been taken had it not been for the Mohegans, whose eagerness for plunder was such that the body of Philip's men escaped, after a short pursuit, and directed their flight to the country of the Nipmucks.[1]

Previous to this, other places in the Old Colony had suffered; and attacks had been made upon Middleborough, Taunton, and Dartmouth.[2] Nor were the ravages of the
July 14. Indians confined to this quarter; for Mendon, in the Massachusetts colony, was attacked in the evening, shortly after sunset, and five or six persons were killed.[3] The body of the Nipmucks had not joined Philip; and the Praying Indians were still friendly to the English. Yet the friendship of the former was wavering. Their young men were ripe for war; the emissaries of Philip were among them; the chieftain himself was hastening to them for succor; and to prevent an alliance, an agent was despatched to negotiate a treaty at Quaboag, now Brookfield.[4]

Capt. Hutchinson, of Boston, was the person chosen to effect this treaty; Capt. Wheeler, of Concord, with a few of his troops were to join him; and three Praying Indians
July 28. served as guides. Marching from Cambridge to Sudbury, and thence into the Nipmuck country, they arrived at

[1] Military Papers, 1. 229–31; Hubbard, 27–8; Baylies, 3. 54; Bliss, 87; Drake's Indians, B. 3. 28.

[2] Winslow, MSS., before quoted; 1 M. H. Coll., 6. 91; Life of Church, 23; Baylies, 3. 41, 47–8.

[3] MS. Lett. of Gov. Leverett to Gov. Winslow, dated July 17, in the Winslow MSS.; Hubbard, 26, 31; Hutchinson, 1. 265; Baylies, 3. 57. The day preceding the attack on Mendon, for securing the frontier towns in Suffolk Co., an order was passed for twelve men to be sent for a week, to join with five or six Indians and friends, to be procured by Capt. Gookin, who were to scout and range in the woods from Mendon to Hingham. Military Papers, 1. 213.

[4] Hubbard, 31; Baylies, 3. 57. A tribe of Indians, known as the Quaboags, lived in this town after its settlement by the English. 1 M. H. Coll., 1. 258. The order for Capt. Wheeler and twenty of his troops to be sent for to come to Boston, &c., was passed at Chas'n., July 16; and there are letters of that and a subsequent date, from Ephraim Curtis, who had been sent by the magistrates to negotiate with the Nipmucks. Military Papers, 1. 214–17, 223, 225, 254.

Brookfield on the following Sunday; and finding the Indians were not there, messengers were sent to seek them, and the chiefs promised to meet the English the next morning at Wickabaug Pond, near Brookfield. Thither the troops marched, accompanied by a few from Brookfield; but finding no Indians, the company kept on, and at the distance of four or five miles, at a place called Mominimisset, where on one side a high hill arose almost perpendicularly from the road, and the other was skirted by a hideous swamp, they were attacked by two or three hundred savages, eight were killed, and Capts. Hutchinson and Wheeler, and three others were wounded. The son of Capt. Wheeler was one of the wounded; but instantly dismounting, and placing his father upon his own horse, and seizing another, whose rider had been slain, the party escaped to the town, which they had scarcely entered when it was fired in different places, and all the houses were consumed, save a few outbuildings, reserved by the Indians for shelter, and one principal building, to which the inhabitants and the soldiers fled for safety. CHAP. XV. Aug. 1, 1675. Aug. 2.

This building was besieged; and for two days the Indians poured in upon its seventy occupants an incessant volley of musketry. Twice a large heap of combustibles was piled against it; but the flames were extinguished by extraordinary efforts. Pieces of cloth, dipped in sulphur, were fastened to arrow heads, and shot at the roof, to set it on fire. Foiled in these attempts, a cart filled with burning flax, hay, and other materials, was pushed up to the walls; but this too, it is said, was quenched by a shower of rain. The scene was terrific. Without were the savages, shouting, and yelling, and "roaring like wild bulls," brandishing their weapons, and furiously assaulting the garrison from every quarter. Within were the English, a comparative handful, cooped up in narrow limits, with women and children hanging around them. But their courage never

CHAP. XV. 1675. quailed. No quarter was offered: no quarter was asked. The besieged and the besiegers were equally resolute; and against fearful odds the former held out.

Aug. 3. At this critical juncture, when escape seemed hopeless, timely relief fortunately arrived. Two messengers had been sent to Boston for aid; one only escaped, and on arriving at Marlborough met Maj. Willard, and Capt. Parker, of Groton, who, with forty-six men, and five Indians, had been ordered to scout in the neighboring towns. Informed of the sufferings of the people at Brookfield, they hastened to their aid; and late on the evening of the 4th, reached the village just in season to save the survivors. The engagement continued through most of that night; and

Aug. 5. towards morning, the Indians, having burnt their shelters, retreated with the loss of about eighty, killed and wounded; and in a swamp a few miles distant, were joined by Philip with the remnant of his tribe, both sannops and squaws.[1]

The Indians upon the Connecticut next entered the field, prowling about Hadley, Hatfield, and Deerfield; and though the tribes at the North-east, bordering upon New Hampshire, took no part in the war at this time, before the end of August the whole Massachusetts colony was involved in as great danger as that to which Plymouth had been previously exposed. Even the Praying Indians were suspected;

Aug 30. and orders were passed to restrain them from hunting, or from travelling, save in the company of the English; and some, of whom the greatest fears were entertained, were confined as prisoners for the public security. A portion of the Praying Indians actually joined Philip; but the larger part were faithful, and many were of signal service as allies and spies. Doubtless much of the credit of preserving

[1] Military Papers, 2. 33; Wheeler's Narr., in N. H. Hist. Coll., 2. 6–23; Hubbard, 31–5, 133; Mather, Mag., b. vii. c. vi; Hutchinson, 1. 265–7; Fiske, in 1 M. H. Coll., 1, 259–61; Baylie's, 3. 58–61; Whitney's Worcester, 63–7; Shattuck's Concord, 48–9; Drake's Boston, 406, &c., &c.

their friendship is due to Mr. Eliot, and to the labors of his indefatigable associate, Gookin.[1]

CHAP. XV. 1675.

The theatre of war being transferred to the Connecticut, the beautiful region watered by that stream, now smiling with villages teeming with plenty, and presenting scenes of gorgeous enchantment to the eye, was dyed with the blood of the wounded and slain. Maj. Willard and Capt. Lathrop were quartered there; and the Nipmucks, and Philip's Indians, being gradually driven back, lurked in that wide extent of forest which bordered the river from Hadley to Northfield; and, hanging upon the skirts of the English villages "like lightning on the edge of the clouds," they came down upon them like the rush of a whirlwind, and their track was marked with as signal desolation.

The settlements in those parts were not very numerous. Long Meadow, upon the East bank, adjoined the Connecticut Colony; and further to the North stood Springfield, where Pynchon resided. Hatfield had but few families; and Northfield, or Squaheag, was also a feeble place. At Westfield, on the West bank, a slight village had sprung up; Northampton was in its infancy; at Hadley there was a more numerous population; and at the foot of the hill where the broad meadows and fertile intervales of Petumtuck stretch out between the Deerfield and the Connecticut, — the Canaan of the valley, environed with delightful mountain scenery, — a few buildings might be seen, which had grown up as by magic within a decade of years. West of these towns, the outposts of civilization, an almost unbroken wilderness extended to the banks of the Hudson. Not a town in Berkshire county had been incorporated.

The Indians in this region had, for so many years, preserved an uninterrupted peace with the English, that no doubts were at first entertained of their fidelity. The

[1] Hubbard, 9, 30, 31; Hutchinson, 1. 269; Baylies, 3. 61; Deane's Scituate, 119; Drake's Boston, 409.

CHAP. XV. 1675. friendship of the races had been strengthened by long intercourse, and reciprocal kindness. There was land enough for all; the bounties of nature were sufficient for all; and why should they contend, when they had all they required? Yet treachery lurked there notwithstanding this calm; and though the Hadley tribe volunteered their aid to fight against Philip, it was soon discovered that they were more ready to betray than to assist the English. The Mohegans were the first to disclose their deceit; and, when required

Aug 25. to surrender their arms, they abandoned their fort, and fled to the camp of the chieftain of Mount Hope. Pursued by a company under Capts. Lathrop and Beers, an engagement ensued near Sugar Loaf Hill, in which the English lost nine men, and the Indians twenty-six.[1]

Sept. 1. A week later, on a fast day, Hatfield was attacked, and in imminent danger of being destroyed; but in the midst of the contest, while the war-whoop was ringing, and just as the Indians were about to triumph, a venerable figure, of commanding aspect, clad in the fashion of a former generation, with his hair white from age, suddenly appeared, and with sword in hand rallied the disordered troops, infused into them fresh courage, and placing himself at their head, the savages were speedily compelled to retire. At the close of the struggle, the visitor vanished as mysteriously as he came; the belief was long cherished that an angel had relieved the town; and years elapsed before it was known that Col. Goffe, who had been a commander in the army of Cromwell's Invincibles, and who was then concealed in Hadley, was the one to whom they were indebted for so timely a deliverance.[2] The same day Deerfield was

[1] Military Papers, 2. 33; Hubbard, 36–7; Mather; Drake's Indians, B. 3. 21; Baylies, 3. 66–7, &c. Capt. Moseley, in a letter dated Lancaster, Aug. 16, speaks of sparing Capt. Beers and twenty-six men to go to Springfield, which was probably the party referred to in the text. Military Papers, 1. 239.

[2] Hutchinson, 1. 201; Stiles's Judges, 109–10.

attacked, and one man killed; and two or three days after, an attack was made upon Northfield. The gallant Capt. Beers had been sent to the relief of this place; but at some distance from the town he was ambushed, and twenty of his men, with himself at their head, were slain.[1] CHAP. XV. Sept. 3 or 4, 1675.

The commissioners of the United Colonies were by this time convened; a narrative from Plymouth was presented; the rise of the war, on the part of that colony, was declared to be defensive; and its vigorous prosecution was adjudged to be necessary, and to be carried on jointly by all the colonies, according to the Articles of Confederation.[2] Yet before troops were levied, further depredations were committed, and a second battle was fought at Deerfield, far more sanguinary than the first. Capt. Lothrop, of Beverly, had been sent thither with eighty picked men, the "flower of Essex," carefully culled, to serve as a convoy to the teams which were bringing down the harvest of the settlements to be deposited at Hadley; and, while marching easily along, unsuspicious of danger, he was suddenly assailed by the invisible enemy at Sugar Loaf Hill, and, after maintaining for several hours an unequal contest, before Capt. Moseley or Maj. Treat could arrive with succor he was totally defeated, with the loss of the greater part of his own men, and a number from Deerfield. This was the severest loss which the English sustained; and the murmuring brook which winds peacefully through the thriving village, bears to this day a name which commemorates the terrible massacre.[3] Sept. 9. Sep. 18.

To Springfield the attention of the Indians was next directed. Hitherto, the natives there had resisted the overtures of Philip, and had promised unfaltering fidelity to the English, giving hostages for the fulfillment of their

[1] Military Papers 1. 254; 2. 33; Hubbard, 37; Mather; Baylies, 3. 68, &c.

[2] Hubbard, 12; Mather, Post., 6.

[3] Military Papers, 1. 264; 2. 33; Hubbard, 38–9; Mather, 12.

CHAP. XV.

pledge, who were sent to Hartford. But now that Northfield and Deerfield had fallen into his hands, and their hostages had escaped, they secretly admitted three hundred of Philip's warriors into their fort at Long Hill, in the night, and a plan was concerted for the destruction of the village. Happily, the plot was discovered in season to prevent its entire accomplishment; and the inhabitants had barely escaped to their garrisons for security, when the whole body of the savages came pouring like a torrent upon the place, and burnt the deserted houses and barns, to the number of upwards of fifty buildings, including that of the minister; but, by the timely arrival of Maj. Treat, with the Connecticut forces, Maj. Pynchon, who was at Hadley, and Capt. Appleton, they were prevented from doing further mischief, and withdrew.[1]

Oct. 4, 1675.

Securing what property was left undestroyed, Maj. Pynchon remained at Springfield, and Capt. Appleton and the rest of the troops returned to Hadley; when the Indians, flushed with success, fell upon Hatfield; but Capts. Moseley and Pool were quartered there; Maj. Treat was at Northampton, not far distant; and Capt. Appleton was at Hadley, which lay nearly opposite; and with such commanders to contend with, how could Philip look for victory? The attack was fatal to his hopes; and though a few of the English were slain, the invaders, some seven or eight hundred in number, after having burned a few buildings, were signally repulsed.[2]

Oct. 19.

This defeat was the greatest which the Indians had sustained; and, as winter was approaching, the savage chieftains prudently withdrew to the fastnesses of the swamps, until the warmth of spring warranted a renewal of hostilities. A few straggling parties skulked about Northampton, Westfield, and Springfield, for several weeks; but their depredations were trifling. The main body retreated to

[1] Military Papers, 1. 274, 283, 285, 287, 289, 291; 2. 33; Hubbard, 41–2, 46–7; Mather, 17.

[2] Military Papers, 2. 33; Hubbard, 43; Mather, 18.

the Narraganset country, and there, or at the westward, Philip hybernated with his men.[1] CHAP. XV. 1675.

As all the colonies were endangered by the war which had now been raging for four months, all felt the necessity of devising prompt measures to prevent future attacks. The Commissioners, at their annual meeting, issued a declaration of war, and agreed that a thousand troops should be levied, of which Massachusetts was to raise five hundred and twenty-seven, Plymouth, one hundred and fifty-eight, and Connecticut, three hundred and fifteen; and at a subsequent meeting, the Governors and Councils of the several jurisdictions were recommended to proceed forthwith, not only to raise their quotas, but to see the men suitably furnished for a winter campaign; for the better management of the affairs of the army, it was agreed that each colony should nominate and commission its own Commander-in-chief; and encouragement was given for the enlistment of volunteers, Indian or English.[2] Sept. 9. Oct. 2.

In accordance with these arrangements, Plymouth promptly proceeded to assume her share of the burden, and at a General Court, holden for the purpose, Maj. Cudworth, of Scituate, was chosen Commander-in-Chief; subordinate officers were appointed; a Committee was raised to "take an account of the charges of the war;" a garrison of twenty-five men was ordered to Mount Hope; the "salaries of the commanders and common soldiers" were fixed; and during the time of danger, it was ordered that every one should take his arms to meeting on the Lord's day, until further notice, furnished with at least five charges of powder and shot, under penalty of 2s. for every default.[3] Oct. 4,

[1] Military Papers, 2. 33; Hubbard, 44–6.

[2] Hubbard, 47–9; Mather, 19; Baylies, 3. 80.

[3] Baylies, 3. 76. Trumbull, in his McFingal, thus alludes to the custom of taking arms to church:

"So once, for fear of Indian beating,
Our grandsires bore their guns to meeting;
Each man equipped on Sunday morn
With psalm book, shot, and powder horn,
And looked in form as all must grant,
Like th' ancient true church militant,
Or fierce like modern deep divines,
Who fight with quills like porcupines."

CHAP. XV. 1675. In Massachusetts and Connecticut, similar diligence was displayed. In the former colony, the forces were divided into six companies, under Appleton, Moseley, Gardiner, Davenport, Oliver, and Johnson; and those of Connecticut were divided into five companies, under Major Treat, and Capts. Seeley, Gallop, Mason, Watts, and Marshall. The command of the whole was entrusted to Governor Winslow, of Plymouth, one of the most able and efficient officers in the country, as well as an accomplished gentleman and a delightful companion, whose singular coolness, intrepidity, and prudence, peculiarly qualified him for so important a trust.[1]

At this stage of their proceedings, another attempt was made to negotiate with the Narragansets; and several of
Oct. 18 the principal chiefs appearing at Boston, the league of the previous July was renewed, and they agreed to deliver up, within ten days, every hostile Indian in their borders, into the hands of the English.[2] Had this agreement been fulfilled, future hostilities would doubtless have been prevented; but the Narragansets, regardless of their promises, continued to procrastinate, and the English were convinced that their real object was to gain time. The power of this tribe was still formidable; and the colonists were aware that, if really hostile, by a junction with Philip all detached settlements would fall into their hands, and the existence of the larger towns would also be jeopardized. Connecticut foresaw this danger, and at once adopted stern and vigorous measures of defense. The military regulations of her General Court are embodied in terms of anxious solemnity. Each county was required to raise sixty dragoons, mounted and armed, who were placed under Maj. Treat; Capt. Avery was appointed to the command of forty men from New London, Stonington, and Lyme, and was autho-

[1] Hubbard, 48–9; Mass. Rec's.; Trumbull; Baylies, 3. 91.

[2] Mather 19; Plym. Col. Rec's.; Baylies, 3. 84.

rized to enlist the Pequots as allies; Capt. Mason was appointed to take charge of another company of twenty English, besides Mohegans; all the towns capable of defense were ordered to be fortified; martial law was established; and it was recommended to the inhabitants of the frontier towns to withdraw to the more populous villages for safety.[1] CHAP. XV. 1675.

A few days later, another meeting of the Commissioners was held at Boston. It was a time of the deepest gloom and anxiety. The perils of a winter campaign were clearly foreseen; but the perils of delay were conceived to be greater. No alternative was left therefore but to act; and the decision of the Commissioners was prompt and earnest. It was resolved to anticipate the intentions of the Narragansets, by attacking them in their own lairs; a declaration of the causes of the war was drawn up and signed; and the necessary measures to ensure success were adopted. The forces from Connecticut were directed to rendezvous at Norwich, Stonington, and New London; those from Massachusetts and Plymouth, at Rehoboth, Providence, and Warwick; General Winslow was to assume his command on the 10th of December; and a "meet number of able ministers and chirurgeons" were provided for the army.[2] Nov. 2.

One more step remained to be taken; and it was recommended to the several courts to appoint the 2d of December "to be observed and kept as a solemn day of prayer and humiliation, to supplicate the Lord's pardoning mercy and compassion towards his poor people, and for success in the endeavors for the repelling the rage of the enemy." This recommendation was adopted; the day of humiliation was observed; fervent prayers were offered at every shrine; and the people of the colonies, committing them-

[1] Military Papers, 1. 298; Trumbull, 1. 336; Baylies, 3. 85; Hist. N. London, 182.

[2] Military Papers, 2. 39, 53, 67–71; 3 M. H. Coll., 1. 66–8; Trumbull, 1. 337; Baylies, 3. 88.

CHAP. XV.

selves to God, were strengthened for the trials which were soon to be encountered.[1]

1675. Dec. 8, On the 8th of December, the Massachusetts troops, under Maj. Appleton, numbering four hundred and sixty-five foot, and a company of seventy-five horse, under Capt. Prentice, Dec. 9. set out from Boston;[2] the next day they marched from Dec. 10. Dedham to Woodcock's; on the following day they arrived at Seekonk; and from thence they set out for the Narragan- Dec. 12 set country. Two days after, they were joined by the Plymouth forces, under Maj. Bradford; and crossing the Patuxet, and marching through "Pumham's country," at night they rendezvoused at Mr. Smith's, in Warwick, which was made their head quarters. The skirmishes on the route, and those of the four following days, were a prelude to the general attack. The taking of Bull's garrison by the Dec. 16. Indians, was an event of great importance, as it deprived the English of their contemplated shelter.

The Connecticut forces, under Maj. Treat, consisting of three hundred English, and one hundred and fifty Mohe- Dec. 17. gans, arrived at Pettyquamscot the day after this garrison Dec. 18. was taken; and the next day they were joined by those of Massachusetts and Plymouth. The whole army was now together; and, notwithstanding the severity of the weather,— for the evening was cold and stormy, and the troops were obliged to remain in the open field, "with no other covering than a cold and moist fleece of snow,"—it was Dec. 19. resolved on the morrow, at day-dawn, to commence the march towards the enemy's quarter, about fifteen miles distant. The troops from Massachusetts, headed by Moseley and Davenport, led the van, and their rear was brought up by Maj. Appleton, and Capt. Oliver; Gen. Winslow, with the Plymouth forces, formed in the centre; and in the rear of the whole were the Connecticut troops, under Maj. Treat.

[1] Baylies, 3. 89.

[2] A list of a portion of these soldiers is given in N. E. Gen. Reg., 8, 241–3; and the original rolls are in the Military Papers, 1. 294, 299, and 2. 72–100.

The gallant Church was already on the ground, performing, with his "brisk blades," marvellous exploits, and preparing for the reception of the Commander-in-chief. CHAP. XV. 1675.

The march of the army was toilsome indeed. The ground was covered with snow, in which, at every step, the soldiers sunk to their ankles; and they were literally compelled to "wade" through the country of the "Sunk Squaw of Narragansett," before reaching their destination; but, notwithstanding these obstacles, about one o'clock they "came upon the edge of the swamp, where their guide assured them they should find Indians enough before night." Before the columns deployed, the firing commenced; and the Indians upon the edge of the swamp retreating to their fort, which was built upon a small island, covering five or six acres of ground, strengthened with palisades, and compassed with a hedge nearly a rod thick, thither the troops resolutely followed them, eager for action. Dec.

There were two entrances to this fort, one "over a long tree upon a place of water," and the other "at a corner," over a huge tree, which rested upon its branches just as it had fallen, so that the trunk was raised five or six feet from the ground. The opening to which this led was commanded in front by a log house, and on the left by a flanker; but as it was the only part of the enclosure accessible, and as the log could be surmounted without much difficulty, the attempt was made by a part of the Massachusetts troops, led by Capt. Johnson. This officer, unfortunately, was killed at the first fire from the enemy; Capt. Davenport, who followed him, met with a similar fate; and a large number of soldiers being wounded or slain by the galling shot of the enemy, the rest retreated from the enclosure, and throwing themselves upon their faces, the bullets passed over them like a shower of hail.

At length the engagement became general. Church was everywhere, skirmishing with the savages. The com-

CHAP. XV. 1675. Dec.

manders rallied their forces, and led them in person, braving the fiercest of the battle with undaunted courage. The Indians on guard were assaulted in front and rear, and driven from the flanker and block-house into the interior of the fort. The soldiers without immediately took possession of these places; and others rushing to their aid, the enemy were driven from one building to another, until the middle of the fort was reached, where the whole mass agglomerated in deadliest strife. The action was bloody and long; but the Indians were routed, and fled into the wilderness. Their wigwams, at least five hundred in number, were immediately fired; and their corn, stores, and utensils, with many of their men, women, and children, perished in the flames. Three hundred warriors are supposed to have been slain; a large number were wounded; and three hundred male prisoners, and as many women and children were taken. The whole number of Indians in the fort is estimated at four thousand; more than one third of these perished or were captured. It was the greatest defeat the natives ever sustained. The English lost six captains; and of the Massachusetts troops, upwards of a hundred were wounded or killed; of the Connecticut forces over seventy; and of those from Plymouth about twenty. It was observed as a remarkable providence, in directing the troops "to begin the assault just at the day they did, for if they had deferred but a day longer, there fell such a storm of snow the next day, that they could not have forced through it for divers weeks after; and then on a sudden there fell such a thaw, that melted away both ice and snow; so that if they had deferred till that time, they could have found no passage into their fortified place."[1]

[1] Military Papers, 2. 103–4; Hubbard, 50–6; Mather, Mag., b. vii. c. vi.; Life of Church, 25–30; N. E. Gen. Reg., 7. 343; Hutchinson, 1. 272–4; Trumbull, 1. 338–41; Baylies, 3.

CHAPTER XVI.

PHILIP'S WAR — 1676.

THE Narraganset fight was an era in the history of Philip's War, and its consequences were greater than were at first anticipated. The enmity of that tribe was now implacable; their alliance with Philip was certain; and, as many had escaped, it was evident that at the opening of spring hostilities would be renewed, and that the war, on the part of the Indians, would be one of extermination. In some respects, the Indians had the advantage of the English. War, with them, was a hereditary pursuit. Living in proximity to the whites, they were intimately acquainted with the location of their dwellings, their places of resort, and their manners and customs. They knew every river, brook, swamp, road, or other peculiarity in the configuration of the country. They were constantly at hand to watch the movements of their opponents, and to attack them at difficult passes, and in unguarded moments. At the outskirts of the settlements was an unbroken wilderness. This enabled them, in bodies or parties, to make their approach undiscovered; and, secret as beasts of prey, skilful as marksmen, and animated with the deadliest feelings of hate, by day and by night they crept into barns, or concealed themselves behind fences, or crouched by the roadside, or even before the doors, so that no sooner did a white man, woman or child appear, than they were instantly shot, or mortally wounded. By the rapidity of their move-

CHAP. XVI. 1675.

ments, they seemed omnipresent. At midnight or at noonday, they were ready for an attack. There was no safety to any one. Asleep or awake, journeying, laboring, worshipping, or resting, all were in jeopardy. The exploring party was waylaid and cut off, and mangled bodies and disjointed limbs were exposed to strike terror into the hearts of pursuers. No mercy was shown to the mother or her babe. The tomahawk and the scalping knife were seldom at rest. The stillness of the Sabbath was broken by the war-whoop; and in passing to or returning from the house of God, or even within its walls, engaged in prayer, the demoniac yell announced their presence; the quick flash and sharp report of their well-aimed muskets dealt indiscriminate slaughter among the flock; and the groans of the wounded, the shrieks of the helpless, and the gasp of the dying, added to the horrors of the frightful scene.

But if the Indians, in these respects, had the advantage of the English, in other respects the advantage was on the side of the latter. Abundantly supplied with arms and ammunition; having towns for their shelter, and garrisons for retreat; united into one body for the common defense; and possessing that recuperative energy which the savage can never enjoy, the contest was unequal, and could not but terminate fatally to the aborigines. Whatever forebodings, therefore, the ravages of the past summer may have excited, the feeling was now that the result was no longer doubtful, and though the struggle might be protracted, the final success of the English was sure.

The retreat from the Narraganset country was attended with incredible hardships and sufferings. Many of the wounded died on the way; and those who were unharmed, were exhausted by fatigue, and famishing from hunger. At length Gen. Winslow reached his head quarters at Wickford. Four hundred of his soldiers, beside the wounded, were unfit for duty. The vessels, which were to have

brought them supplies, were ice bound at Cape Cod.[1] The depth of the snow, which commenced falling afresh, made travelling toilsome, and diminished the prospect of relief overland. Almost perishing, few were the comforts and miserable was the condition of the frost bitten troops. Yet they bore all with patience, trusting in God. CHAP. XVI. 1675.

But if the condition of the English was deplorably wretched, how much more appalling must have been that of the Indians! Driven from their wigwams, the shades of the forest were their only shelter. All their stores, "their curiously-wrought baskets, full of corn, their famous strings of wampum," and their nicely lined dwellings, were consumed; and the survivors were exposed to the horrors of famine, or left to escape to the more distant tribes.

After so fierce an encounter, there was a temporary lull in the storm of war. Exhausted by the fight, both parties were willing to pause for a breathing spell; and the Indians, who had suffered most, were in the least fit condition to renew the struggle. Yet it was not the policy of the English to give them long to rally; the vigorous prosecution of the war was decreed by the Commissioners of the United Colonies,[2] and troops of horsemen scoured the country, and "brought in daily much of their corn and beans, which they had hid under the ground." Stragglers, wandering in quest of food, were frequently captured; and Capt. Prentice, in "Pomham's country," despoiled a hundred wigwams, but "found never an Indian" in any of the huts. Proffers of peace were made in vain. Ninigret only inclined to submit. Canonchet sullenly refused to yield. His proud spirit could brook no alliance with the Dec. 25. Dec. 27.

[1] Church, 29, says one vessel arrived at Smith's the night of the Narraganset fight, laden with provisions; and with this agrees the London Tract of Oct. 13, p. 2; but a MS. Lett. of Richard Smith to Gov. Winslow, dated Dec. 25, seems to speak of this as a Connecticut sloop, upon which an embargo was laid. See Winslow MSS., deposited with Charles Deane, Esq.

[2] Military Papers, Mass. Ar., 2. 105.

CHAP. XVI. 1675.

whites, and the blood of his tribe cried for vengeance. "We will fight to the last man, rather than become servants to the English," was his haughty reply returned by the messengers.[1]

About the middle of January, it was reported that the Indians were fleeing to the Nipmucks. The Commissioners
Dec. 28. had previously ordered three hundred fresh troops to be
Jan. 10, 1675-6. raised and sent to the camp, and in the depth of winter they waded through the snow to join their companions.[2] But neither the vigilance of the officers, nor the daring of the soldiers, could entirely prevent the depredations of the ene-
Jan. 27. my; and, as they fled into the interior, they "despoiled Mr. Carpenter of two hundred sheep, and fifty head of neat cattle, and fifteen horses." This was a timely supply. It atoned in a measure for the loss of their own stores. And, as they passed on their way, by the number of horse's heads which they left in their path, it was perceived, by their pursuers, that they "dealt much in horse-flesh."[3]

The army of the English was soon on their track, though the forces from Connecticut had mostly returned; and, as the troops pressed on in hot pursuit, they captured a few of the enemy, but were unable to come to a general
Feb. 5. engagement; and on reaching Marlborough, their provisions failing, they turned down to Boston, leaving the field to the ravages of the Indians.[4]

The Narragansets, the Nipmucks, the Quaboag, and River Indians, and the remnant of Philip's tribe were not long in

[1] Hubbard, 58; London Tract of Oct., 13.

[2] Military Papers, 2. 106–7; Hubbard, 58; Mass. Rec's., vol. 5; Plym. Rec's., of Dec. 27, 1675. On the 6th of January, the Commissioners ordered one thousand recruits for Gen. Winslow, to be mustered at head quarters before the 20th inst. Military Papers, 2. 111–12.

[3] Hubbard, 60, Mather, 22; Trumbull, 1. 341.

[4] Military Papers, 2. 131; Hubbard, 55, 60; Mather, 22. On the 7th of Feb., an order was passed for billeting the Plymouth forces at Marlborough. Military Papers, 2. 131.

effecting a junction; and it was reported by the Praying Indians, sent out as spies, that "a man from Canada had been amongst them, animating them against the English, and promising them a supply of ammunition."[1] Thus encouraged, their first principal attack was upon Lancaster, a village of fifty or sixty families; and, early in the morning, the assault was commenced in five different places. Most of the unfortified houses were burned, and several persons were killed; but the only garrison destroyed was that at and around the house of Mr. Rowlandson, the minister, in which forty-two of the soldiers and inhabitants had taken refuge. This was set on fire; and the flames spread with such rapidity, that the only alternative left to the inmates was to surrender or die. The few who attempted to escape were instantly shot, and the survivors reluctantly consented to yield. Most of the men were slain without mercy; but the women and children, above twenty in number, were carried into captivity; and among these was the wife of Mr. Rowlandson, with three of her children, one of whom died of its wounds in the wilderness. The father was at Boston when the attack occurred, or he too would have perished with the males of the garrison. And who can paint the anguish of his soul, when the tidings reached him of the fate of his family? Yet it pleased God to sustain him, and he confidently believed that the prisoners would be restored. The sufferings of Mrs. Rowlandson were exceedingly severe, and her narrative is one of thrilling interest. She was redeemed in a few months, and restored to her home; and her children, a month later, were also returned.[2]

CHAP. XVI. 1675-6.

Feb. 10.

May 3, Jun. 28.

Upon the news of the disaster at Lancaster, Capt. Wadsworth was sent to its relief; and recovering a bridge which

[1] Hubbard, 76. These Indians were sent out Dec. 25. Military Papers, 2. 105.

[2] Mrs. Rowlandson's Narr.; Hubbard, 60–1, 82; Mather, 28, 37.

CHAP. XVI. 1675-6. the enemy had partially destroyed, he entered the town with his forty men, unknown to the Indians, and fell upon them with such courage that they were forced to retire; but the village had suffered so much that it was "abandoned to the pleasure of the insulting foe."[1]

Mond'y Feb. 21. A few days later, two or three hundred Indians "wheeled down to Medfield," which they surprised early in the morning; and, though there were a number of soldiers garrisoned in the town, nearly half the houses were burned and about twenty persons killed, before the troops rallied.[2] In consequence of these tragedies, a day of fast-

Feb. 23, ing and prayer was held; but in the midst of the observances, in "the old meeting house in Boston," there were rumors that the Indians were but ten miles distant; and

Feb. 24. the next day Weymouth was attacked, and seven buildings were burned.[3]

Feb. 8. Previous to this date, a meeting of the Commissioners had been held at Boston, at which the speedy prosecution of the war was recommended; and six hundred additional soldiers were ordered to be levied, to meet within three weeks at Quaboag, or some other rendezvous. The colony of Connecticut was desired to enlist the Pequots and Mohegans in its service; and, as Maj. Winslow, through indisposition, was unable to resume his post as Commander-in-chief, it was voted that the Commander-in-chief of the colony in which the war should be, should act as chief over the whole.[4] In accordance with these votes, companies of volunteers from New London, Stonington, and Norwich, were formed under Maj. Palmes, and Capts. Denison, Avery, and Stanton; Mohegans, Pequots, and friendly Narragansets were associated with them; and towards the

[1] Hubbard, 61.
[2] Military Papers, 2. 139; Hubbard, 61, 63, 83; Mather, 23; London Tract of Oct. 13, p 3.
[3] Hubbard, 66; Mather, 23.
[4] Baylies, 3. 108.

last of the month, they began to range the Narraganset country, and to harass the enemy, continuing their incursions until they had driven them from those quarters.[1] Feb. 27. 1675-6.

The ravages of the Indians in Massachusetts were now renewed, and Groton was attacked, and several houses Mar. 2. were rifled; a week later further damage was done; and Mar. 9. four days after there was a third attack, which resulted so Mar. 13. disastrously that the town was deserted, and in the course of a few weeks the garrison and stores were removed.[2] Apr. 17, 1676.

For the protection of the western frontier, Maj. Savage, of Boston, was sent thither in the beginning of March, to join with the Connecticut forces; and a few days after his arrival, Northampton was attacked, and the palisades Mar. 14. 1675-6. forced; but no sooner had the Indians effected an entrance, than they were vigorously assaulted, and compelled to retreat with such precipitation that they escaped with difficulty without the barrier, and sustained considerable loss before they could accomplish that object.[3]

The government of Massachusetts, apprehensive of the Mar. 15. dangerous condition of her frontier towns, appointed a committee to devise means for their safety; and a line of stockades was proposed from the Charles river to the Mer- Mar. 23. rimack; but, on account of the difficulties of the enterprise, it was abandoned, and garrisons were ordered to be estab- Mar. 28. 1676 lished in each town, and a select number of minute men, who, upon the first approach of the savages, were to spread the alarm. Scouting parties were also advised to be kept constantly ranging.[4]

Meanwhile the colony of Plymouth again became the theater of war, and an attack was made upon Plymouth

[1] Trumbull, 1. 343; Hist. N. London, 185.—Hubbard says this was in March.

[2] Hubbard, 72-6; Mather, 23-4; London Tract, of Oct. 13, p. 4.

[3] Hubbard, 77; Mather, 23; 3 M. H. Coll., 1. 68-70; Trumbull, 1. 356, &c.

[4] Military Papers, 2. 174; Mass. Rec's., vol. 5.; Hist. Concord, 55-7, Charlestown, 180, and Newbury, 118.

CHAP. XVI. 1676. itself, and twelve persons were murdered. The government was aroused; and, as danger impended over all the settlements, Capt. Pierce, of Scituate, was ordered to march in pursuit of the enemy; and reaching Seekonk with about

Mar. 25. fifty men, and twenty Indians from Cape Cod, an attack was made upon a party in that vicinity, which was without loss on his side. Passing the night in the village, on the

Mar. 26. next day he prepared for a second engagement. At a short distance from the town, four or five Indians were discovered, limping as if wounded. Suspecting no treachery, the company eagerly followed them, and found themselves in the presence of an overwhelming force. To escape was impossible; to retreat was desperate. A furious attack ensued; and a fresh body of Indians appearing, the gallant band, like the Spartans at Thermopylæ, were completely surrounded, and after a brave resistance of above two hours, in which Capt. Pierce and his men fought in a double ring, he was totally defeated. Nearly all the English fell, besides several of their allies. Of the assailants, over a hundred are supposed to have been slain. The people of Rehoboth hastened to the rescue, but ere they arrived, the deed was done. The soldiers lay "on the bed of honor," and nothing remained but for the "spectators to perform the last office of love to them."[1]

Mar. 28. Soon after, a party of the Indians crossed the river to Seekonk Common, and late in the night, or very early in the morning, laid the town completely in ashes. Only two houses escaped the conflagration; one, the garrison on the Plain, and the other, at the south end of the Common, which was preserved by arranging blackened sticks around, to give it at a distance the appearance of being guarded. At sunrise the village was a smouldering ruin. But one

[1] Military Papers, 2. 177; Hubbard, 64–7; Mather, 25; London Tract, of Oct. 13, 1676, p. 5; Newman's Lett., in Deane, 122, and Bliss, 91.

life was lost, — that of Robert Beers,[1] a religious enthusiast, who refused to flee, and died with his Bible in his hands, which he had seized as a talisman to secure him from harm.[2] The next day Providence was attacked, and thirty houses were burned.[3]

Alarmed at the destruction of Rehoboth, and at the "near approach of the enemy," the Council of War of the Old Colony was convened, and it was voted that three hundred English, and one hundred Indians should be raised, to take the field by the 11th of April; but at the next meeting of the Council, it was found that it had been impossible to muster so many men. A "special deficiency of Scituate and Sandwich" was complained of; but the first of these towns had suffered by the loss of Capt. Pierce and his men, and was too weak to furnish its quota of fifty. The defense was accordingly left to the towns. Yet there was no deficiency of zeal in the colony; and besides protecting their own firesides, we shall find them hereafter sending out as many as were apportioned to them in the fall of 1675, and doing good service in ending the war.[4]

Mar. 29.

The day of the defeat of Capt. Pierce, was a day of calamity in the Massachusetts colony; for Marlborough was attacked, the greater part of the town was burned, and the place was so desolated that it was abandoned by its inhabitants.[5] At Long Meadow, near Springfield, a party of eighteen English were assailed on their way to attend public worship, and "a man and a maid" were killed, others were wounded, and two women and children were seized as captives. The next day an attempt was made for

Mar 26.

[1] Not *Wright*, as in the London Tract of Oct. 13, p. 6, and in Baylies, 3. 113.

[2] Hubbard, 67, 133; Mather, 26; Bliss, 95–6.

[3] Mather, 26; Staples, Ann. Prov., 162–8.

[4] Deane, 124; Winsor's Duxbury, 105.—In Military Papers, 2. 196–7, are Letters from Plymouth, of Mar. 31, recommending the establishment of a flying army, and from the Council of Mass., of Ap. 3, in reply, objecting to the same.

[5] Military Papers, 2. 180, 181; Hubbard, 79; Mather, 24–5, 27.

CHAP. XVI. 1676. their rescue, but "the two children were knocked on the head as they were sucking their mother's breasts," and the mothers were wounded: yet "one was alive when the soldiers came to her," and able to state "what the Indians had told her."[1]

The fate of Capt. Pierce was a prelude to that of the unfortunate Wadsworth; and the Sudbury fight is as memorable in the annals of the Massachusetts Colony, as is Pierce's Fight in the annals of the Plymouth Colony. It Apr. 21. was on the morning of Friday[2] that this attack commenced, when a body of Indians, said to have numbered fifteen hundred, fell upon the village, consumed several houses and barns, and killed several persons. A company from Watertown, aided by citizens of Sudbury, were the first who engaged the assailants, on the East bank of the river; but after a severe contest they were compelled to retreat. Immediately a corps from Concord was detached, and, as they arrived near Haynes' garrison, they were ambushed, and ten of them slain, — one only escaping. Capt. Wadsworth, of Milton, had just arrived at Marlborough; and learning the danger of Sudbury, he hastened to its relief, with all his soldiers, and Capt. Brocklebanck, of Rowley. These recruits arrived in the afternoon, and about three o'clock were ambushed, and all, but a few who escaped to a mill, were slain. In the course of the morning, messen-

[1] Hubbard, 77–8; Mather, 25; London Tract, of Oct. 13, p. 6.

[2] The date on Wadsworth's monument, is Ap. 18; and the London Tract, p. 10, says the 20th; but Mather, 27, Gookin, in Archæol. Am., Sewall, in his Diary, and the Middlesex Records, all say the 21st, which we regard as the true date. Besides, in Military Papers, 2. 220, 234, are Letters from Mass., of Ap. 21, and from Plymouth, of Ap. 26, in reply, which agree in assigning the 21st as the day of the battle; and in fol. 243 of ibid., is another Lett., from Gov. Winslow, of Ap. 30, corroborating the same. See further, N. E. Gen. Reg., 7. 221.— Hubbard, 79, 135, is the only one who says the 18th. About this time, Ap. 21, a proposition from an unknown person was made to the Governor and Council of Mass., that *dogs* should be employed to hunt the Indians; but there is no endorsement of action in the premises, nor does it appear that Mass. favored the bloody proposal. Military Papers, 2. 214–15.

gers had been sent to Boston for aid; and reaching Charles- CHAP. XVI.
town at the beginning of the afternoon Lecture, Maj. 1676.
Gookin and Mr. Danforth withdrew from the meeting house, and ordered a ply of horses, belonging to Capt. Prentice's troop, under conduct of Capt. Phipps, and an Indian Company, under Capt. Hunting, to march without delay. The Indian Company, forty in number, being on foot, did not reach Sudbury until "a little within night;" and laying upon their arms until morning, after blackening Apr. 22.
their faces they crossed the bridge to reconnoitre, but "the enemy were all withdrawn." The dead of Capt. Wadsworth's company lay scattered upon the ground, and were interred as decently as circumstances would permit.[1] The same day, the Colonial Council ordered forty troopers, out of Suffolk, under the command of Cornet Eliot, and a like number from Middlesex, under Maj. Gookin, to march to Sudbury to watch the motions of the enemy.[2]

The Indians, by this time, were reduced to great suffering, and were forced to live upon ground nuts and horse-flesh. This bred diseases, of which numbers died. Besides, their season for planting had arrived; something must be done to provide for the future; and their fish for winter stores must be caught now if ever. The war had been protracted to an unusual length; they were unaccustomed to continue so long in a hostile position; and their resources were rapidly and daily diminishing. Hence some of the chiefs were inclined to suspend hostilities; and a person who was acquainted with the Indians about Lancaster adventured to treat with them, and redeemed Mrs. Rowlandson. Encouraged by his success, the Council sent others to second his efforts, and a number of prisoners were ransomed and returned.[3]

[1] There are the usual discrepancies in the accounts of this battle, and we have endeavored to reconcile them as well as we were able.

[2] Mather, 27; Mass. Rec's., vol. 5.; Shattuck's Concord, 59.

[3] Hubbard, 81–2.

CHAP. XVI. 1676. But if the Nipmucks were apprehensive of the prowess of the English, elsewhere the colonial troops were actively engaged; and the Connecticut forces, under Capt. Denison, with his Indian allies, succeeded in capturing Canonchet, the chief sachem of the Narragansets, and the son of Miantonomo, who had ventured down early in April towards Seekonk, with about thirty of his warriors, for corn to plant in the deserted towns on the Connecticut. Learning
Apr. 9. of his presence, Capt. Denison went in pursuit, and overtaking him near the Blackstone, fell upon his camp near the spot where Capt. Pierce had been slain. The surprise was complete. The chieftain fled, casting aside his silver-laced coat; and, as he plunged into the river, he fell, and his gun was wet and rendered useless. This accident unnerved him; and one of the Pequots plunging in after him, with but a feeble resistance the sachem was seized. A youth of the English troops, Robert Stanton, was the first to approach him; but the chieftain haughtily repelled his advances. "You too much child; no understand war. Let your chief come, him I will answer." He was offered his life on condition of his submission; but, "like Attilius Regulus," the offer was refused. He was then sentenced to die. "I like it well," was his reply, "I shall die before my heart is soft, and before I have spoken anything unworthy of myself." Such heroism evinces a dauntless spirit; yet the captive was taken and shot at Stonington, by the Mohegans and Pequots, and his head was cut off and sent to Hartford. Policy dictated this step: "thereby the more firmly to engage the said Indians against the Narragansets."[1]

Of the expeditions of the troops under Maj. Palmes, why need we speak? Numbering less than seventy volunteers,

[1] Mather, 27; Hubbard, 67, 139–41; London Tract, of Oct 13. p. 9; Trumbull, 1. 343–4.—Staples, Ann. Prov., 168, says Canonchet was taken Ap. 4.

and a few over a hundred Indians, they scoured the country until they had killed or captured upwards of two hundred of the enemy, and had driven out all the Narragansets, save those under Ninigret, and "all without the loss of one man, killed or wounded."[1] CHAP. XVI. 1676.

But if success attended the Connecticut forces, suffering and sorrow were in the homes of the Pilgrims; for Plymouth was again assaulted, and several houses and barns were burned; a few days after other buildings were burned in what is now Halifax; and the remainder of the village of Middleborough was devoted to destruction.[2] Bridgewater was likewise attacked, with some damage, and in midsummer it was again assaulted; but it is noted as a little remarkable, that, although this was an inland village, and much exposed, not one of its inhabitants was slain throughout the war. The troops from this town were actively engaged, and more than once sent out parties to scout, who seldom returned without having met with some slight encounter.[3] The attack upon Scituate was of more importance. The savages entered the town from Hingham, and burning the saw-mill of Cornet Stetson, on the third Herring brook, and the houses of Capt. Joseph Sylvester, William Blackmore, Nicholas the Swede, and others, and leaving unharmed Barstow's garrison, they came to Stockbridge's garrison, near the lower part of the town, which was desperately besieged: but the Indians sustained such losses from the well directed shot from within, that they retreated in haste, and, after assaulting the Block-house, near the river, they withdrew from the town entirely. One incident is mentioned, which illustrates the perils and escapes of every town. At the house of one Ewell, an infant was quietly sleeping in its cradle. The grandmother, on

May 11.

May 8.

July 14, 15.

May 20

[1] Mather, 33, 39; Hubbard, 68, 142; Trumbull, 1. 345.

[2] Hubbard, 83; Mather, 29.

[3] Hubbard, 70–2; I. Mather, 29; C. Mather, Mag., b. vii. c. vi.; Mitchell's Bridgewater, 39.

CHAP. XVI. 1676.

the approach of the Indians, in despair or forgetfulness fled to the garrison, leaving it behind. The savages entered the house, and took the bread from the oven, but left without discovering the slumbering child. After their departure, the grandmother, with palpitating heart, crept timidly back, and to her joy found the little one safe in its retreat. Taking it to the garrison, in a few hours the house in which it had been left was burned to the ground. The veteran Cornet Stetson was never more active than on this stirring occasion, for his own house was in danger, and all that were dear to him; but, happily, his family for the most part escaped unharmed, though the buildings of some of his children were burned. Thirty of the soldiers of the town were absent when the attack was made; fifteen had been slain with Pierce at Rehoboth; and, so greatly was the strength of the settlement reduced, it was only by extraordinary efforts that any were saved. As it was, twenty-two dwelling houses and barns were destroyed; six heads of families, besides others, perished; and seven were wounded and crippled for life. The loss of property was at least £500.[1]

Meanwhile in the Massachusettss Colony vigorous measures of defense were adopted, and several companies of fresh soldiers, both horse and foot, were raised by order of the General Court, placed under the command of Capts. Sill, Cutler, Holbrook, Brattle, Prentice, and Henchman,

Apr. 27. and sent out to "range the woods towards Hassanamesit," now Grafton, where they succeeded in capturing small parties of the enemy, among whom were some of "considerable rank;" but the season proving rainy, and many being

May 10. sick, after a short campaign the troops were released "for the recovery of their health," and returned, for the most

[1] Winslow's Lett. to Hinckley, of May 23, 1676, in Hinckley MSS. vol. 1. fol. 5, Mass. Hist. Soc.; 1 M. H. Coll., 6. 92; Deane's Scit., 125–8, 401. Cornet Stetson was the author's maternal ancestor.

part, to Boston.[1] Nearly at the same time, scattering parties of savages were skulking about Springfield; and, as there were many gallant officers in that region, Capt. Holyoke fell upon the enemy, with ten or twelve young men, and put them to flight.[2] Days of fasting and prayer continued to be held in the churches, to pray for the success of the English arms; and the tidings from all quarters began to be more hopeful. Letters from Connecticut stated that the Mohegans had joined the English; that great sickness prevailed among Philip's men; and that his ranks were fast thinning by death and desertion.[3] CHAP. XVI. 1676. May 10

Upon the banks of the Connecticut, important events were transpiring. Reports reached Northampton and Hadley, that there was a large body of Indians seated at the upper falls, engaged in fishing, and living so carelessly that they might be easily surprised. This was a stimulus to exertion, and a despatch was sent to Hartford for aid; but before troops arrived, about a hundred and fifty of the most resolute, from Hadley, Hatfield, and Northampton, under Capts. Holyoke and Turner, marched silently in the dead of night, and arrived at the camp of the Indians early in the morning. The savages, having "made themselves merry with new milk and roast beef," were buried in a profound slumber; and the assailants dismounting, and fastening their horses, made a bold charge on foot, and with such success that a "great and notable slaughter was made amongst them." But a report being circulated that Philip was approaching at the head of a thousand warriors, the victors hastily retreated; and being attacked on their march, and pursued several miles, a number were killed,— May 18.

[1] Hubbard, 85.—In the Military Papers, 2. 241, is a Lett. from Hadley, of Ap. 29, relative to a proposed attack upon the Indians at their fishing stations. "Could we drive them from their fishing," it says, "and keep out though but lesser parties against them, famine would subdue them."

[2] Hubbard, 86.

[3] Hubbard, 82–3; Mather. 29.

CHAP. XVI among the rest Capt. Turner, who "received his fatal stroke as he passed through the Green River," and whose name is perpetuated in that of the beautiful falls near which his corpse was afterwards found.[1]

1676.

May 30. A few days later Hatfield was attacked, and a number of buildings were burned; but by the aid of a party from Hadley, the enemy were repulsed. Nearly a fortnight later, and subsequent to the arrival of the troops from Connecticut, Hadley itself was attacked, by a body of seven or eight hundred Indians, early in the morning, who lay in ambush at one end of the town, while an alarm was spread at the other end; but the forces from Connecticut, numbering about five hundred, English, Pequots, and Mohegans, with those from Massachusetts left by Maj. Savage, and the troops of the neighborhood, formed a body so large that little could be accomplished by the assailants; and a "piece of ordnance" being discharged against them, completed their panic, and they hastily fled.[2]

Jun. 12.

The Council of Massachusetts, warned by these proceedings that the Indians were still resolutely bent on war, ordered out again the troops who had been discharged shortly before; and Capt. Henchman was sent to the Westward, to assist in the expulsion of the savages from those parts. On his way he fell in with a few Indians near Lancaster, who were captured; and effecting a junction with the Connecticut forces, both banks of the river were scoured as far as the Great Falls.[1] By these movements the haunts of the savages were broken up; and becoming discouraged, the different tribes began to quarrel with each other — the "Hudson and Petumtuck" Indians charging their losses upon Philip; and "every one shifting for himself," the

May 30.

[1] Hubbard, 87–9; Mather, 29, 30; Life of Church, 32; London Tract, of Oct. 13, p. 12.

[2] Hubbard, 89, 94. In the Military Papers, vol. 3. fol. 11, is a Lett., without date, giving an account of the losses at Hatfield.

[1] Hubbard, 90–1.

"Nipmuck and River Indians" bent their course to the West and to the North; the Narragansets retired to the South; and Philip was left alone, deserted by his allies, and with but a handful of his own men rallying around him.[1] CHAP. XVI. 1676.

Mournfully, therefore, the chieftain turned his face towards Mount Hope; and, as the bewildered bird, when the home that has sheltered her is wreathed in flames, flutters dazzled and affrighted around the nest of her little ones, and at last sinks a victim to the devouring element, so this son of the forest, whose all was bound up in the soil which had nourished him, — the home and the grave of his fathers before him, — when he found that the power of the white man was invincible, still clung tenaciously to his foothold upon the loved haunts so endeared to his memory, lingered irresolute, unwilling to yield, and preferring to die where his ashes might mingle with the ashes of his sires, and the winds as they blew might sigh out his requiem.

A cordon of military posts soon surrounded his refuge; and the full forces of the colonies were concentrated near Mount Hope. Maj. Talcot, of Connecticut, was there, with three hundred English soldiers, and some friendly Indians. At the solicitation of Plymouth, two companies from Massachusetts marched to Seekonk, to join Maj. Bradford and the troops of the Old Colony. Capt. Brattle, with his horsemen, and Capt. Moseley, with a foot company, were already on the spot. The Indians were flocking thither, and Philip, it was said, was at the head of the remnant of his tribe, ravaging the country, and determined to sell his life as dearly as possible.

Why follow the movements of both parties day by day? Why speak of the attacks upon Swanzey and Taunton?

[1] Hubbard, 95-6.

CHAP. XVI. 1676. Why dwell upon the gallant exploits of Church, and others? Bodies of the Indians daily deserted the desperate cause, and surrendered to the English, sueing for peace. The family of Philip was taken, and his wife and his son were in the hands of the whites. The heart of the chieftain was ready to break. He had lost all worth striving for, and, instead of longer struggling against visible fate, he was prepared to offer himself upon the altar of his country. The lines were drawn closer and closer. Escape was impossible. Completely hemmed in, the chieftain was at bay. His days were numbered, and in darkness the star of his destiny was to be quenched. Bereft of his family; bewailing the loss of his followers and friends; deserted by his allies; with his subjects falling around him as the leaves of the forest, the last of the Wampanoag chiefs remained almost alone. Hunted backward and forward as eagerly as ever fox, or boar, or midnight wolf was pursued by the sportsman; compelled to flee from point to point; he was driven at last to his lair at Mount Hope; and, withdrawing to the spot which had cradled his infancy, and delighted his maturer years, that one worn and haggard man, with an infuriate multitude seeking his blood, sullenly awaited the doom which impended.

Aug. 12 It was welcome news to Capt. Church, that his enemy was in such straits; and, without a moment's delay, gathering around him his few trusty followers, he prepared to put the finishing stroke to the war. A deserter guided him to the side of the swamp whither Philip had withdrawn; and upon a spot of upland, at its Southern end, and at the foot of the Mount which had been the throne of the chieftain, the victim awaited the approach of his pursuers. Creeping upon their bellies, as cautiously as the tiger advances upon its prey, Church and his companions wound their way in. Every man had his orders, and every one was posted to the best possible advantage. The quick

report of a musket is heard; a full volley follows: and Philip, half naked, is seen hastily fleeing. An Englishman covets the honor of shooting him. His gun misses fire. And the ball of an Indian pierces his heart. He falls! Philip of Mount Hope will sound the war-whoop no more! The body of the chieftain lies stretched upon the ground, and the desolating war is brought to a close.[1] Shall we publish the record, that the son of the chieftain was sold as a slave? Shall we detail the particulars of the capture of Anawan? The Indians never recovered from the blow. Their power was broken, and they were rapidly dispersed. They fought to the last for the land of their sires, but what could they effect against the power of the English?

The aggregate of suffering remains to be told. At least thirteen towns were wholly destroyed, and a large number of others sustained much damage. Six hundred of the colonists fell upon the battle field, and many of the survivors bore with them to the grave marks of their desperate and bloody encounters. There was scarcely a family in which some one had not suffered. Connecticut escaped with very little loss. Upon Massachusetts and Plymouth the principal burden fell. The whole expense of the war, including losses and disbursements, cannot be computed at less than half a million of dollars: — a large sum for those days, and as great in proportion as the cost of our national struggle for independence. More than six hundred buildings were consumed by fire. It was years before some towns recovered, and were rebuilt.[2]

We have no disposition to detract in the least from the merits of our fathers, or to reflect upon their conduct as unusually culpable. Doubtless, to their minds, the war was justifiable. Yet in vindicating them from misappre-

[1] Hubbard, Mather, Church, &c. [2] Trumbull, 1. 350–1.

CHAP. XVI. 1676.

hension, let us not forget that the tale of the savage has never been told. It is true that

> "Small slights, contempt, neglect, unmixed with hate,
> Make up in number what they want in weight,"

And of these, the Indians experienced enough. No one, who possesses the benevolent spirit which the gospel commends, can fail to be deeply interested in the fate of these sons of the forest — the original occupants of the soil, possessing, with all their vices, many estimable traits; sharing the feelings which are common to all hearts; moved by the passions which agitate every breast. Yet that is, in our estimation, a mawkish sentimentalism, which lavishes upon them the most glowing eulogiums for the purpose of tarnishing the luster of Puritanism. It should never be forgotten that they were an uncivilized race, and that their survivors yet remain such; and all, who contrast the condition of this continent in the middle of the nineteenth century, with its condition at the opening of the seventeenth century, will readily concede that the change which has been wrought here by the introduction of a new race, and the influence which the New World has exerted upon the Old, the lessons of political wisdom which have here been taught, the advancement which has been made in the arts and the sciences, and especially the problems of spiritual interest which have here been successfully developed, are monuments to the memory of the men who settled these wilds, sufficiently glorious, and sufficiently praiseworthy, to atone for those errors, which the history of all ages teaches us have been common to mankind, and from which no nation or people, however enlightened or intelligent, and in the enjoyment of the most brilliant and widely diffused advantages, has been wholly exempt.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE DOWNFALL OF THE CHARTER.

THE defeat of the Commission of 1664, did not relieve the colonists permanently from the interference of Charles and his Ministers of State. On the contrary, a new Council for Plantations was appointed; and at its first meeting "at the Earl of Bristol's house in Queen Street, Lincoln's Inn Field," the affairs of America were discussed, and there were "great debates," in which the King himself took part, "in what style to write to New England." It was believed by the Monarch that Massachusetts, the principal colony, was "rich and strong," and "able to contest with all other Plantations about them;" and he was not without fears of "their breaking off from all dependence" on the English nation. Hence the proposition of a "menacing letter," favored by some of the Council, was opposed by those "who better understood the peevish and touchy humor of that colony;" and, after several days deliberation, it was concluded that, if any paper was sent, it should be "conciliatory." The representations of Cartwright, one of the old Commissioners, had, doubtless, a powerful influence in leading to the adoption of this course; for, when summoned to "give a relation of the country," he drew a picture so alarming to the courtiers, that all thoughts of "threatening" the colonists were abandoned, and nothing was recommended beyond a "letter of amnesty," which was prepared, and eventually "agreed to be sent."[1]

May 26, 1671.

June 6.

Jun. 21.

July 4.

[1] Evelyn, Diary, vol. 2.

CHAP. XVII.

Yet many were reluctant to relinquish the attempt to conquer the spirit of a people whose very refractoriness stung their pride; and the proposition was made that an Agent or Deputy should be sent over, under the pretext of adjusting boundaries, but in reality to ascertain the true state of the country, and "whether they were of such power as to be able to resist his Majesty, and declare for themselves, as independent of the crown."[1] Col. Middleton was of opinion, that the best way to proceed was by force of arms; and declared, that the people might easily be "curbed by a few of his Majesty's first rate frigates, to spoil their trade with the Islands;" but more pacific councils prevailed, and it was decided to adhere to the former conclusion, and to "advise his Majesty to send Commissioners with a formal commission for adjusting boundaries."

1671 Aug. 3.

It was easier, however, to adopt such a conclusion, than to carry it into effect; and six months later, the Council was found deliberating on "some fit person to go to inspect their actions in New England, and from time to time to report how that people stood affected." In truth, the Court was emasculated of its manliness by its lechery, and had not the courage to provoke once more the defiant spirit before which it had already quailed. No agents, therefore, were sent to the colonies; and in the following fall, the Council for Plantations was constituted a Council for Trade and Foreign Plantations; and, having appointed a Committee to "examine the laws of his Majesty's several Plantations and Colonies in the West Indies," with this step their proceedings terminated for a season.[2]

Feb. 12, 1671-2.

Sept., 1672.

Meanwhile, Massachusetts continued without opposition to enjoy the rich blessings of a peaceable government;

[1] The date of the report of the Council for Plantations, is Aug. 12, 1671, in 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 285.

[2] Evelyn, 1. 434–59; Hubbard, 732; Bancroft, 2. 90–1.

exercised her jurisdiction in New Hampshire and Maine; and was even projecting settlements further to the eastward, in the province of Acadia. The French, on the one side, were removed from her neighborhood, and the Dutch, on the other, were no longer feared. There was no limit, therefore, to the extension of her commerce. Acting as the carrier for nearly all the other colonies, her trade was as extensive as she could reasonably desire. Vessels from many nations might be seen in her harbors. No custom house was established. The laws of Navigation were practically inoperative. Wealth was fast flowing into the coffers of her merchants. And industry and contentment everywhere prevailed.[1]

In the midst of this plenty, the chiefs of the colonies were gathered to the grave. Wilson, of Boston, "orthodox in judgment," yet "zealous against known evils;" Flint, of Braintree, a "man of known piety, gravity, and integrity;" Mitchell, of Cambridge, the "stay of New England," and the "gem of the churches;" Allen, of Dedham, revered as a pastor; the younger Eliot, "endowed with gifts of nature and grace;" Mather, of Dorchester, a "solid and grave divine;" the thrice honored Davenport, the pride of two colonies; Symmes, of Charlestown, an accomplished scholar; the tolerant Willoughby, beloved as a magistrate; the upright Bellingham, "a foe to bribes, but rich in charity;" the excellent Prince, long Governor of Plymouth; and others of the patriarchs and men of esteem, were among those who departed, lamenting not so much that their career was thus ended, as that they were "born too soon to see New England in its most flourishing state."[2]

Happy for them that they did not survive longer, for

[1] Hutchinson, 1. 246–7; Chalmers, Ann., 400, 433–4; Josselyn, in 2 M. H. Coll., vol. 3.

[2] Morton's Mem., Anno. 1665, et seq.; Hubbard, 604–7; Hutchinson, 1. 237–8.

CHAP. XVII.

shadows were fast darkening the pathway of the people. It was the destiny of New England to pass through severer trials before she emerged into this "flourishing state." The cry of her enemies was not easily stopped; and again, like blood-hounds, they were baying upon her track. The petitions of Robert Mason and Gorges were renewed;[1] rumors were circulated that Massachusetts had concluded a peace with the Dutch, and was defrauding the King by carrying tobacco from Virginia to France, and the sea ports of Holland;[2] and, while she was advised of "a great design on foot for the regulation of New England," it was at the same time lamented that there was no agent in England to speak in her favor.[3] One friend had counselled her to purchase the claims of Gorges, "least in the future they prove prejudicial;"[4] and, had this advice been at once adopted, it might, perhaps, have freed her from her most persevering opponents; for, finding their efforts hitherto fruitless, both Gorges and Mason listened with eagerness to a proposal to dispose of their claims to the King, who purposed to unite Maine with New Hampshire, and form of the same a principality for his favorite son, the Duke of Monmouth. But the gentleman who was "all agog to goe governor thither," was "dealt withall," and "such discouragements layd before him, and the ridiculousness of hoping for such a revenue as was proposed of £5000 a year, or more, to the Duke," that it was hoped the project would be laid aside.[5] It was deemed prudent, however, to make overtures for the settlement of these claims, and authority was given to offer Gorges £500 to relinquish his; but he was then "in the clouds," having expectations of greater profits than the agent held forth.[6]

1674.

[1] King Charles's Lett., in Chalmer's Ann., 446.

[2] Hutch. Coll., 443–4, 462–3, 468–9, 470–1.

[3] Knowles, in Hutch. Coll., 447; Boyle, in ibid., 450–1.

[4] Thompson, in Hutch. Coll., 449.

[5] Collins, in Hutch. Coll., 451.

[6] Lett. to Thompson, in Hutch. Coll., 467, and reply, 470.

CHAP. XVII.

The commercial freedom enjoyed by the colonies, and the wealth which their enterprise was fast pouring in upon them, provoked the envy of the merchants of England; and complaints were made by these merchants, and by the manufacturers, that this widely-extended traffic, if not checked in season, "would not only ruin the trade of this kingdom, but would leave no sort of dependence from that country to this." Applications from such a source are seldom unheeded; the Committee on Foreign Plantations listened with deference; and it was resolved to "settle collectors in New England, as in the other places, that they might receive the duties, and enforce the law." Should these officers be obstructed, the other plantations were to be forbidden to trade with them; the captains of the royal frigates were to bring in offenders; no Mediterranean passes were to be granted their vessels, to protect them from the Turks, until it was seen what dependence they would acknowledge on his Majesty;[1] and soon after a Proclamation was issued, prohibiting the importation of any of the commodities of Europe into the Plantations, which were not laden in England, and for putting into execution the laws of trade.[2]

1675.

Nov. 24.

The scheme of Gorges and Mason for the disposal of their claims to the King, failed of its accomplishment through the poverty of the monarch; and the persevering proprietors, resolved not to relinquish their attempts, once more petitioned for the restoration of their lands. Information of this step, and of general complaints against the colonies, were received by Governor Leverett, with the proposed design of sending a Commissioner hither, accompanied by a sufficient force to back his instructions; and though it was intimated that the project might be delayed for a season, "by reason of more weighty affairs and the

Dec. 22

[1] Chalmers, Ann., 400–02, 436; Revolt, 1. 128–9.

[2] 3 M. H. Coll., 7. 136–7. This Proclamation, it is said, did not reach Boston until Oct. 1680. Hubbard, 734, note.

CHAP. XVII. 1675. want of money," yet it was added, that a letter would certainly be forwarded, ordering "some account of these things to be given" his Majesty. "I fear," writes their advocate, "I fear that which is aimed at is to call your Patent to a strict account, upon what terms you hold it." "You would do well," he adds, "to be in preparation for it, especially to make good your title to that part of your government."[1]

The General Court at this time had no standing agent in its employ in England; yet it was faithfully served by several persons interested in the welfare of the colonies, and, for its own protection, funds had been furnished them to fee clerks of the Privy Council, from whom early information, and copies of state papers were expected to be obtained.[2] By these means, imitative of those which England itself was pursuing, and other nations of Europe, in the management of their political intrigues, it was constantly advised of the posture of affairs abroad, forewarned of dangers, and enabled to provide the means of defense. Yet neither the vigilance of their allies, nor the intercession of "My Lord Privy Seal, the Earl of Anglesey," to whom a letter was written,[3] could "entangle for a long time," or wholly "evert" the "business" which it was hoped to delay; for 1676. in the following year, letters were written to the Colonial Governors commanding them to enforce strict obedience to the Acts of Trade, and commissions were sent empowering the administration of the requisite oaths. To Massachusetts, "the most prejudicial Plantation to the Kingdom of England,"[4] it was determined to send a special messenger. The complaints of Gorges and Mason had been examined, and others had been preferred by the Dutch; and the

[1] Collins, in Hutch. Coll., 471–5; Randolph, in ibid., 507; Orders in Council, in 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 285.

[2] Collins, in Hutch. Coll., 47; Chalmers, Ann., 461–2.

[3] Chalmers, Ann., 395.

[4] Sir J. Child's Discourse on Trade, 135; Hubbard, 734.

King wrote that agents should be sent over, who should appear before him in six months after the reception of his letter, or judgment would be given against the General Court even in its absence.[1] Mar. 20, 1675-6.

It was in the height of the distress of Philip's War that this project of "reassuming the government of Massachusetts" was resolved upon in England; and, while the people were yet contending with the natives for the possession of the soil, and the ground was wet with the blood of the slain, and the war cry was ringing in the forests of Maine, the mendacious Randolph, a kinsman of Mason, and a fit engine of despotism, — a man whose insolence and whose turbulence gained for him the execration of the people whom he sought to oppress, — set out to cross the Atlantic in a ship sent for his conveyance, bearing letters from his Majesty, instructions from the Lords of Trade, and copies of the petition of Mason and Gorges; and arrived before Boston shortly after the annual election of magistrates had passed.[2] Mar. 30, 1676. Jun. 10.

Waiting immediately upon Governor Leverett, and producing his credentials, he was informed that the Council was to meet in the afternoon, and that he should be sent for to attend; and appearing at the time fixed, his Majesty's letter, with the petitions, were delivered and received; and, after a short consultation, he was dismissed with the answer that "they should consider of these things."[3] Having been entrusted with other letters, from Mason to his friends, these were delivered, and the messenger was received with "much kindness," and expressions of "great loyalty to his Majesty." The contents of these letters, as was intended, were carefully noised abroad for popular effect; and a report being in circulation that "the Duke of

[1] Randolph's Narr., in Usurpation Papers, vol. 2. fol. 218; 4. M. H. Coll., 2. 286; Chalmers, Ann., 395; Hubbard, 734.

[2] Randolph's Narr., in Usurpation Papers, vol. 2. fol. 218; Hutchinson, 1. 280, and Coll., 503.

[3] Hutch. Coll., 504.

CHAP. XVII. 1676. York and divers of the nobility, upon discontents, had left the Court, and applied to the city for assistance, and that all was going to confusion at home," Randolph applied himself to expose the falsity of this report, and "confuted it by many arguments, so that in a short time it vanished."[1]

Jun. 15. After two days consideration, it was resolved by the Council that "thanks be rendered to his Majesty for his gracious letter, and that an answer be forthwith sent by a master of a vessel ready to sail for London;" and Randolph being again sent for, he was informed of these proceedings, and asked if he had "anything further to offer for his Majesty?"—and replying in the negative, the Governor, with great coolness, "said that he looked upon me as Mr. Mason's agent, and that I might withdraw."[2]

Jun. 16. In an interview on the following day, with Governor Leverett alone, Randolph took occasion to allude to the Act of Navigation, and to animadvert upon its violation by the colony; to which it was replied, that the laws of England were binding no farther than consisted with their interests; that, by the charter, full legislative powers were conferred upon the Company; that all matters in dispute were to be concluded by their determination, without any appeal; and that his Majesty ought not to retrench their liberties, which he had agreed to confirm, but leave them to enjoy, or even to enlarge the same, inasmuch as upon their own charge, and without any contribution from the crown, they had "made so large a plantation in the wilderness."[2] It is somewhat singular that opinions similar to the above were being cotemporaneously avowed in Ireland; and, as particular persons there did penance for adhering to them, so shall we find this was one cause of the loss of the Massachusetts Charter.[4]

[1] Hutch. Coll., 504, 505, 510.
[2] Hutch. Coll., 505–6.
[3] Hutch. Coll., 506.
[4] Hutchinson, 1. 290–1.

A week later, Randolph again appeared, and a memorial was presented reminding the Council of "his Majesty's command of sending over agents," and requesting a General Court to be convened to consider the same; but to this the only answer returned was, that when he was ready to sail for England, he should have a copy of the letter which they had written to his Majesty.[1] With this reply he was obliged to content himself; and early in the ensuing month he set out for New Hampshire, and travelled through several of its towns, acquainting the people with the purpose of his visit to the country, and endeavoring to incite them to renounce their allegiance to Massachusetts.[2] Apparently satisfied with the result of this journey, he returned to Boston; and soon after, on the reception of a message from Governor Winslow, of Plymouth, he visited that colony, where, he affirms, great dislike was expressed of the carriage of the magistrates of Boston towards his Majesty; complaints were made of the encroachments of Massachusetts upon the neighboring colonies; and "he" — Governor Winslow — "finding the inconveniences of a divided government daily arising, did say, that New England would never be secure, flourish, nor be serviceable to his Majesty, until the several colonies and plantations were reduced under his Majesty's immediate government; and that the colonies of New Plymouth and Connecticut would readily and willingly submit to his Majesty's pleasure and commands in the disposal and settlement of the civil government."[3]

CHAP. XVII. Jun. 23, 1677. July.

Similar complaints, he also says, were made to him in Boston, where many of the principal inhabitants, some of whom were chief officers of the militia, expressed the hope

[1] Hutch. Coll., 507.
[2] Hutch. Coll., 507–8.
[3] Hutch. Coll., 508–9. I have seen MS. letters written by Randolph to Gov. Winslow, from which it appears they were on quite friendly terms. These letters are deposited with Charles Deane, Esq.

CHAP. XVII. 1677

that the royal authority would be duly established, and entreated him to represent to his Majesty how oppressed they were, — for they dare not themselves publicly express their desires:[1] — but there is reason to doubt the correctness of these statements, at least in their amplest form, as even Hutchinson, whose "loyalty" no one will impeach, emphatically remarks, that "not one man in a hundred, throughout the government, then desired such a change."[2]

July 20. Towards the last of July, "being ready to return to England," Randolph applied for his despatches; and, after being sharply rebuked for "publishing the substance of his errand into those parts," he was furnished with a duplicate of a letter addressed to Secretary Coventry, which he was told was the answer of the Council to his Majesty's letters;

July 30. and with this he departed, being "entreated by the magistrates," — so reads his own narrative — "to give a favorable report of the country," and told "that those that blessed them God would bless, and those that cursed them God would curse."[3]

Aug. 9. Early in the ensuing month, a special court was convened, which the clergy were desired to attend, to decide upon "the most expedient manner of making answer to the complaints of Gorges and Mason, whether by sending agents, or answering by writing;" and it was agreed, that it would be best to send agents, "provided they be with utmost care qualified as to their instructions, by and according to which they may negotiate that affair, with safety to the country, and with all duty and loyalty to his Majesty, in the preservation of our patent liberties."[4]

[1] Hutch. Coll., 498–9, 509–10.

[2] Hutch. Coll, 499, note.

[3] Randolph's Narr., in Usurpation Papers, vol. 2. fol. 218; Hutch. Coll., 510. Randolph reached England Sep. 10, and presented to the Board of Trade his narrative of the country and government, and exhibited articles of high misdemeanor against the Governor and company. This is probably the Document published in Hutch. Coll.. 477–511, as Randolph's Narr., and dated Sep. 20, and Oct. 12, 1676.

[4] Colonial Papers, 2. 25; Chalmers, Ann., 396; Hutchinson, 1. 281; Belknap's N. H., 1. App. xiv.

With this advice the Court concurred; and William Stoughton, the second son of Mr. Israel Stoughton, and a graduate of Harvard College; and Peter Bulkley, son of the venerated minister of Concord, and Speaker of the House of Deputies, were chosen for that purpose; and being furnished with the answer to the petition of Mason and Gorges, and particular instructions for the conduct of their mission, they set sail to attend to its duties. These agents "demeaned themselves with good care and discretion;"[1] and soon after their arrival, a hearing was had before the Lords of Trade and Plantations and the Lords Chief Justices, subsequently before the Chief Justices alone, and finally before the Privy Council; and the representations of Randolph having been duly considered, judgment was given against the claims of Massachusetts, which was denied the right of jurisdiction over Maine and New Hampshire; the former province was confirmed to Gorges and his heirs, both as to soil and government; and for the government of the latter, a commission was issued by the crown, and, though the residents in those parts would have gladly continued as before, Massachusetts forbore further jurisdiction.[3]

CHAP. XVII. 1677. Oct. 30.

The Bay Colony, however, was not to be thus defeated; and a merchant of Boston, John Usher, was immediately employed, who purchased for £1200, the whole right and interest of Gorges' heirs, and assigned it over to the governor and company. This step, which was attempted to be construed as champerty, instead of conciliating matters, gave great offense to the King; and though pecuniarily of

[1] Letter of the King, in Hutch. Coll., 519.

[2] 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 287; Chalmers, Ann., 396; Hubbard, 744; Belknap's N. H., 1. App. xv.

[3] Randolph, Narr., in Usurpation Papers, vol. 2. fol. 218, says: "the Agents from Boston attended two years, and made good my charges against the Governor and Company at the Council Chamber. The agents confess the fact, pray his Majesty's pardon, and acknowledge his Majesty's right to the government of the Province of New Hampshire.

CHAP. XVII.

1677. little benefit, it was the cause of a series of relations, which continued for a long period, and under which a novel form of political institution ensued, — Massachusetts, in her corporate capacity, becoming lord proprietary of the soil, and governing the country as a province, under the charter of Gorges.[1]

But the agents were not yet to be dismissed, for it had been determined to "search the conduct of New England to the very root;" and, as their powers related only to a defense against land claims, they were enjoined to procure an enlargement of the same, and to inform their employers that his Majesty was "determined to do what was right," and though he would not "destroy their charter, he had resolved to reduce them to a more palpable dependence on his crown, in order that they might be of use to him in times of necessity:" — but no fuller powers were granted, and they were left to act in obedience to former instructions.[2]

It was against fearful odds that the struggle was con-

Dec. 1. tinued. Mr. Stoughton wrote home that "the country's not taking notice of these Acts of Navigation" had been the most unhappy cause of neglect;[3] the complaints of the Quakers, who had again been made the subjects of persecution, were added to former grievances;[4] allegations were brought by Randolph and Sir Edmund Andros against the administration of the government of the colony;[5] and, after the agents had appeared several times before the King in Council, and the Lords of Trade, and had been

April, 1678. required to take the Oath of Allegiance, to the Crown Lawyers, Jones and Winnington, a series of questions of the highest importance was proposed, covering the principal points in dispute. These were:

[1] Hutchinson, 1. 281–2; Chalmers, Ann., 397; Bancroft, 2. 113–14. In some places, the sum paid is said to have been £1,250. See Chalmers, Ann., 454.

[2] Chalmers, Ann., 403–4, 436–8.

[3] Letter, in Hutchinson, 1. 288.

[4] Hutchinson, 1. 288.

[5] Chalmers, Ann., 446; 2 M. H. Coll., 4. 287–8.

1. Have the people of Massachusetts any legal charter?

2. Did not the Quo Warranto of 1635, work the dissolution of such charter as they had?

3. If the charter was originally good, has not the company, by maladministration, forfeited the same so as to be now at his Majesty's mercy and disposal?

On the first of these questions, an opinion was declined, as it had already been decided affirmatively; to the second they responded in the negative; and to the third they answered, that if the alleged misdemeanors could be proved true, and to have been committed since the Act of Oblivion, they did not contain sufficient matter to avoid the Patent, which could be done no otherwise than by a new Quo War ranto.[1]

Pending the agitation of these matters, days of fasting and prayer were observed in the colony, and a Synod of the churches was called, to inquire into the reasons which had provoked the Lord to bring his judgment upon New England, and to implore the continuance of his favor and blessing;[2] several addresses, replete with loyalty, were sent to the King from the General Court;[3] and to remove the grounds of complaint against their legislation,[4] high treason was made a capital offense; all persons above sixteen years of age were required to take the oath of allegiance;[5] and the king's colors were ordered to be set up in the halls of justice. But it was more difficult to conform to the laws of trade. Submission to an Act of Parliament, so long as they were unrepresented in that body, was apprehended, even at that early date, to be an invasion of their rights

[1] Chalmers, Ann., 405, 438-40.

[2] Mass. Rec's., Hutchinson, &c.

[3] Mass. Rec's.; Hutchinson, 1. 289-92, and Coll., 515-16; Hubbard, 738.

[4] Chalmers, Ann., 440-1.

[5] Yet at the Court held in Oct. 1677, a law reviving and administering an oath of fidelity to the country was passed, of which the King complained as "a snare in the way of his good subjects." Letter, in Hutch. Coll., 515-16, Dated Ap. 27, 1678.

CHAP. XVII. 1678. and liberties; and the laws of England, it was contended, were bounded by the four seas, and did not reach America. It was known that the Acts of Navigation were evaded in Rhode Island, and openly contemned and violated in Connecticut; and those colonies were permitted to practice such irregularities without opposition. The determination of the King, therefore, to enforce these Acts in Massachusetts, could only spring from his arbitrary desire to cripple the commerce of that colony, the most dreaded of all. Yet, reluctant to hazard everything by a too stubborn resistance, an expedient was devised to obviate these scruples which had arisen, and by a special Act of the colony itself, "the said acts of navigation and trade" were adopted as part of its own policy, and obedience to the same was strictly enjoined.[1]

It had been previously agreed in England that a Governor should be sent over, wholly supported by his Majesty, and authorized to see that his orders were observed; and the Lords soon after recommended Randolph to Lord Treasurer Danby as the most proper person for Collector of the
May. Port of Boston, who was appointed and commissioned, and
July 9. furnished with instructions from the Commissioners of the Customs in London; but before entering upon the duties of his office, the question arose, how he was to be supported? — and the High Treasurer asking how his expenses
Mar. 10, 1678-9. were to be defrayed, unless from the Exchequer? — the Lords, in consideration of the difficulties which were likely to arise, suggested suspending his departure until a final resolution could be taken in the premises.[2]

The General Court, in one of its addresses to the King,
Oct. 16, 1678. had supplicated his Majesty that its messengers, having

[1] Hutchinson, 1.; Chalmers, Ann.

[2] Chalmers, Ann., 406, 441–2; Hubbard, 737; 3 M. H. Coll., 7. 128–9. King Charles, in his Lett. of July 24, 1679, speaks of the appointment of Randolph as Collector, &c., for N. Eng. Hutch. Coll., 521.

despatched the business entrusted to them, might be at liberty to return, and "not be obliged to make answer to such complaints as were made by unquiet spirits, seeking not his Majesty's, but their own advantages, and the distresses of the colony;"[1] but the "popish plot" so engrossed the attention of the Court, that several months elapsed before they obtained leave to depart, with letters to "keep things in a fair and probable way of amendment, until a fitter season should present;" nor did they reach Boston until late in the ensuing winter, where, soon after, Randolph, the Collector of Customs, arrived, whom the people were recommended to help and assist "in all things requisite in the discharge of his trust."[2]

CHAP. XVII. 1678. Jan. 20, 1679. Dec. 23.

For the safe return of the agents, a day of thanksgiving was appointed, and a vote was passed thanking them for their services; but Randolph, the evil genius of the colony, who, as was said, like a certain other noted personage, "went up and down seeking whom he might devour," so far from being welcomed to the country as a public benefactor, was treated "more like a spy than one of his Majesty's servants;" a "paper of scandalous verses" held

[1] Hutch. Coll., 517. Holden, Green, and Harris, about this time (Dec. 4, 1678) brought their charges against Massachusetts. 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 288–9, 290–2.

[2] 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 289.—Randolph, Narr., in Usurpation Papers, vol. 2. fol. 218, &c., says: "Sep. 10, 1679. The Boston Agents have leave to return, and new agents to be sent with full power. Oct. 23, I was commanded to go to N. Eng. by way of N. York, to carry over his Majesty's commission of government directed to a President and Council in N. Hampshire. Oct. 29, I shipped all my goods and household stuff of a considerable value, upon a vessel belonging to N. Eng., and all are lost at sea, together with his late Majesty's picture, and royal arms sent to N. Hampshire. Dec. 7, arrived at New York, and travelled by land thence to N. Hampshire, in the winter, near four hundred miles. Dec. 27, arrived in N. Hampshire, and after great opposition made by the Bostoneers, settled his Majesty's government in that Province. Jan. 15, his Majesty's government declared and owned in N. Hampshire. Jan. 28, returned to Boston, empowered by his Majesty's Commissioners of Customs to prevent irregular trade, and seized several vessels with their lading. 1680. His Majesty's authority and the acts of trade disowned openly in the country, and I was cast in all these causes, and damage given against his Majesty."

CHAP. XVII. him up to general derision; and all persons took the liberty "to abuse him in their discourses."[1]

July 24, 1679. The letter of his Majesty brought over by the agents contained requisitions which demanded instant notice. These were, that new agents should be sent within six months to attend to such business as remained unsettled; that freedom of conscience should be granted to members of the Church of England, who were not to be discountenanced from sharing in the government of the colony, nor were they or any others, not being Papists, who "do not agree in the Congregational way," to be subjected to fines, forfeitures, or other incapacities, on account of their views; that no other distinctions should be observed in making freemen, save that "they be men of competent estates, ratable at ten shillings," and all such were to be eligible to office, and all laws obstructing the same were to be repealed; that the full number of eighteen assistants should henceforth be observed, as by charter; that the oath of allegiance should be taken by all persons "coming to any privilege;" that military commissions, and proceedings of justice, should run in his Majesty's name; that all laws repugnant to the laws of trade should be abolished; that an assignment of the purchase of Gorges' claim should be made to the King, on repayment of the purchase money; and that all commissions granted for governing in New Hampshire should be recalled.[2]

A part of these demands had been already complied with; and provisions were made for conforming to others; but obedience to the first was delayed. Yet a reply to his May 21, 1680. Majesty's communication was prepared;[3] and a second Jun. 12. letter was despatched a few weeks later.[4] To these an

[1] Chalmers, 408; Hutchinson, 1. 292–3; Randolph's Letter, in 1 M. H. Coll., 6. 92–4.

[2] Hutchinson, 1. 293–4, and Coll., 519–22; Chalmers, Ann., 408–9.

[3] Referred to in the King's letters of Sep. 1680, and Oct. 1681. See Chalmers, Ann., 447, and Hutch. Coll., 523.

[4] See Chalmers, Ann., 447.

answer was returned, censuring their disobedience and studied neglect, and commanding them, on their allegiance, "seriously to reflect upon his directions, and to send over, within three months, such persons as they saw fit to choose, furnished with sufficient instructions to attend the regulation and settlement of their government, and to answer the claims which Robert Mason had set up to the lands between the Naumkeag and Merrimack rivers."[1] This letter reached Boston in the winter, and a Court was convened to consider its contents; the "book of laws" was "carefully perused;" and agents were chosen in compliance with his Majesty's demands; but they peremptorily refused to engage in the service, alleging "the danger of the seas;" whereupon another letter was sent to Sir Lionel Jenkins, one of his Majesty's Secretaries of State, deprecating the displeasure of the King, as they had endeavored to give evidence of their obedience; and expressing the hope that the consequent delay, and the lapse of time, would not be "reflected upon as proceeding from the want of loyalty and allegiance, which we humbly profess that we will always bear."[2]

CHAP. XVII.

Sep. 30, 1680.

Jan. 4, 1680-1.

Jan. 3 1681.

Soon after this Court convened, Randolph, "soured by disappointment," and thwarted in the execution of his Majesty's commission, returned to England; and laying before the King his "Humble Representation of the Bostoneers" he vented the full torrent of his spleen against the colonists, whom he accused as "usurpers, forming themselves into a Commonwealth, denying appeals to England, neglecting the oath of allegiance, protecting regicides, coining money of their own impression, inflicting the pen-

Mar. 15, 1680-1.

[1] Hutch. Coll., 522–5; Chalmers, Ann., 410, 447.—A second letter upon the subject of Mason's claims, was written by the King, June 23, 1682, which was acted upon in the following March. 3 M. H. Coll., 72–4.

[2] Hutch. Coll., 527–8. There is a letter from John Higginson of Salem, relative to this meeting of the Court, in Mather MSS., vol. 4. fol. 1.

CHAP. XVII.

alty of death for religion, resisting his Majesty's Commissioners, even by an armed force, imposing an unlawful oath of fidelity, and violating all acts of trade and navigation." "All these things," he added, "I am ready to prove:"—and having thus discharged his "pent-up wrath," and obtained a renewal of his commission, he embarked again for Boston, bearing a letter from the King, dated

Dec. 17, 1681.

October 21, and safely arrived in the following winter. Here again his commission was opposed, being "looked upon as an encroachment upon their charter;" and, as he per-

Mar. 10, 1681-2.

sisted in his attempt to enforce its provisions, a law was revived by the assembly to try him for his life, "for acting by his Majesty's Commission before it was allowed by them;" the Commission itself was not allowed to be openly read in Court; and his deputies and under officers were imprisoned for acting in obedience to his orders.[1]

The King's letter of October 21, was calculated to awaken serious apprehensions. After detailing at length the intercourse of the sovereign with the colonies of New England, from the first grant of their charter to that moment, the complaints against Massachusetts for stubbornness and insubordination, the measures which had been taken for their redress, the appointment of Commissioners in 1664, their treatment, and their recall, the demand that agents should be sent, and the refusal to comply with that demand, the subsequent mission of Messrs. Stoughton and Bulkley, the neglect to comply with the requisitions of his Majesty, the continued illegal conduct of the government,

[1] Randolph's Narr., as before; Hutch. Coll., 525–6; Chalmers., Ann., 410, and Revolt., 1. 132. Randolph adds: "May 20, 1681. The Right Honorable the Lords of the Committee of Trade reported to his Majesty that in consideration of my good services, I ought to have £100 annually added to my salary; but his Majesty's service requiring my speedy return, I was despatched away, and that addition not settled. Dec. 17, I arrived again at Boston in N. Eng., with his Majesty's commission appointing me Collector, &c., but the commission is opposed, being looked upon as an encroachment upon their Charter," &c. Narr., in Usurpation Papers, vol. 2. fols. 218–20.

and the contempt which Randolph had experienced, it concludes with the following startling announcement: — "We once more charge and require you forthwith to send over your agents fully empowered and instructed to attend the regulation of that our government, and to answer the irregularity of your proceedings therein; in default whereof we are fully resolved, in Trinity term next ensuing, to direct our Attorney General to bring a Quo Warranto in our Court of King's Bench, whereby our charter granted unto you, with all the powers thereof, may be legally evicted and made void."[1] CHAP. XVII. 1681-2.

After such a summons, delay was hazardous; and the Court speedily assembling, his Majesty's letter was read, and it was determined with all despatch to send agents to answer for the colony. It was with great reluctance that this course was taken; and the persons selected to discharge this trust evince the revolution in feeling which was fast approaching its crisis. Hitherto, the action of the magistrates had been bold and determined. The demands of the Monarch had been successfully resisted, and the government, "constant to its old maxims of a free State, dependent on none but God,"[2] had gone on, from step to step, manfully struggling for its vested rights, and determined not to swerve a hair's breadth from its own interpretation of the charter, unless forced by circumstances beyond its control. But, as the first race of emigrants had nearly all departed, and a new generation had come upon the stage, and among the people there were many who were wearied with these incessant struggles, which ended only to be renewed; and as the population had largely increased, and there were many, besides Episcopalians, opposed to the ecclesiastical constitution of the col- Feb.

[1] This remarkable document is given in full in Chalmers, Ann., 443–9. See also Hubbard, 741.

[2] Bancroft, 2. 50.

CHAP. XVII. 1682.

ony; the power of the clergy had become measurably weakened by the infusion of new elements into the religious controversies of the day; dissensions had arisen even in the churches of Boston; the party in favor of rigidly adhering to the long established policy of the rulers, at the head of whom were Danforth and Gookin, was daily losing ground; and those who were inclined to yield to the demands of the King, of whom Bradstreet was the leader, were increasing in strength. Hence, through their influence, William Stoughton and Joseph Dudley, two of their own party, the last a man of inordinate ambition, a finished courtier, and an adroit politician, were chosen to wait upon his Majesty, to attend his behests. The former, however, declined serving; and the old party rallying, John Richards, a firm friend of the Charter, was chosen in his place. Thus one of the agents was as pliant as the osier; the other was firm as the rugged oak.[1]

Every day it became more evident that the intention of the King was not to "regulate" but to recall the charter. Hence the agents were solemnly charged "not to do, or consent to, anything that should violate or infringe the liberties and privileges" granted by the charter, or the government established thereby; and with these
May 31. instructions they departed, followed by the prayers of the
Jun. 22. people for the success of their mission. Randolph, however, ever active, and attentive to the interests of his employers, not only forwarded a letter acquainting them with the "servility" of Dudley, and the "factiousness" of Richards, but he determined personally to follow the agents, to be in readiness to disclose anything which they might desire to conceal. According to his own statement, he was requested, at his departure, to do nothing to the

[1] Hutchinson, 1; Chalmers, Ann., 412. Their letter of recommendation to Sir Lionel Jenkins, is given in 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 306, dated May 29, 1682.

prejudice of the colony, and, with characteristic insincerity, he solemnly promised, that, if they would make a full submission, he would endeavor to procure his Majesty's pardon and the continuance of their privileges so far as to secure liberty of conscience, and the free exercise of their religion, and that no money should be raised by assessments upon the people without their consent; and for other matters, their agents were most proper to solicit.[1] CHAP. XVII. 1682.

Previous to his setting out, however, his pen had been busy in laboring to defeat the very objects he had so solemnly promised to cherish; for letter followed letter to the Bishop of London, and the Earl of Clarendon, the chief burden of which was the demand for a Quo Warranto. "So long as their Charter remains undisturbed," was his cry, "all his Majesty saith or commands signifies nothing here." "His Majesty's Quo Warranto against their Charter, and sending for Thomas Danforth, Sam Nowell, a late factious preacher, and now a magistrate, and Dan Fisher, and Elisha Cooke, deputies, to attend to answer these articles of high misdemeanor I have now exhibited against them, will make the whole faction tremble." "Nothing will so effectually settle this government on a firm dependence upon the crown, as bringing a Quo Warranto against their Charter, which will wholly disenable many now great stricklers and promoters of the faction among us, from acting further in a public station." "'Till this government be thoroughly regulated, all that his Majesty commands will signify nothing. This independency in government claimed and duly practised by us, is one chief occasion of the many mutinies and distractions in other his Majesty's foreign plantations."[2]

But Randolph had other ends to subserve besides the

[1] Hutchinson, 1. 302, and Coll., 534; Chalmers, Ann., 414.

[2] Hutch. Coll., 531–40; Mather MSS., vol. 6., fol. 57.

CHAP. XVII. 1682.

discomfiture of the agents and the overthrow of the Charter. A zealous Episcopalian, in correspondence with prelates of the National Church, and employed by them to circulate publications in favor of Episcopacy,[1] he was earnest that the worship of that church should be set up in Boston, and that ministers should be sent over to carry out this plan; and he hoped, through the agency of Dudley, to bring this to pass.[2] Nay, he had even the effrontery to propose that the funds, the proceeds of individual subscription, which had been raised for propagating the gospel among the Indians, should be perverted to this end.[3] "Send over," says he, "able and sober ministers, and we will contribute largely to their maintenance; but one thing will mainly help, when no marriages shall hereafter be allowed lawful, but such as are made by the ministers of the Church of England."[4] And, not satisfied with even these propositions, bold as they were, he insinuated that the "factionists" might be attainted of treason, and their property sequestered to the church, "for," he says, "if his Majesty's laws, as none but fanaticks question, be of force with us, we could raise a sufficient maintenance for divers ministers out of the estates of those whose treasons have forfeited them to his Majesty."[5]

It is evident that it had been resolved in England to push matters to the utmost extremity. Massachusetts must be humbled. Her spirit of independence must be effectually subdued. Her ecclesiastical heterodoxy must be signally punished. Crown and Council, prelates and peers, merchants and manufacturers, had all leagued together to break down the charter, drive out the magistrates, cripple the commerce of the country, weaken the clergy, and ride rough shod over the "prejudices" of the people, by exalting the hierarchy to an equality with the colonial

[1] Hutch. Coll., 532–3.
[2] Hutch. Coll., 533.
[3] Hutch. Coll., 531, 551.
[4] Hutch. Coll., 533.
[5] Hutch. Coll., 540.

priesthood, — nay, by giving it the advantage of a foreign support, backed by the donations of the affluent in England. CHAP. XVII. 1682.

It had long been a source of grievance and complaint, that the colonists had, from the outset, shown such an aversion to the priesthood of apostolic descent, and had succeeded in entirely preventing worship in the Episcopal form; and it was hoped that the change contemplated would introduce a new order of things. "I boldly write it," says Randolph, "that the settling of the country, and putting the government into the hands of honest gentlemen, some of whom are already in the magistracy, and discountenancing utterly the faction, will be more grateful to us; for now our consciences as well as our bodies are in captivity to servants and illiterate planters."[1]

The agents of the colony, Messrs. Dudley and Richards, upon their arrival in England found his Majesty greatly provoked at the neglect of the colonists in not sending before; and in their first letters home they acquainted the Court with the feelings of the King, and desired to know whether it was best to hazard all by refusing to comply with his demands — intimating that they "seriously intended to submit to the substance." At that time they had not been heard before the Council; but soon after, on presenting the address which had been forwarded by their hands, they were commanded to show their powers and instructions to Sir Lionel Jenkins, Secretary of State; and on their perusal, finding these powers wholly inadequate, they were informed by Lord Radnor, that the Council had agreed, *nem. con.*, to report to his Majesty that, unless further powers were speedily obtained, a Quo Warranto should proceed in Hilary term.[2] It was Aug 20. Sep. 20.

[1] Hutch. Coll., 533.

[2] Orders in Council, in 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 292-3. Randolph, Lett. to Gov. Hinckley, in Hinckley MSS., 1. 41, speaks of a Quo Warranto against Plymouth also.

CHAP. XVII. 1682. to no purpose that they humbly craved the royal pardon for former irregularities, "which had been continued through inadvertence, and not through contradiction," and promised, for the future, a strict compliance with the "rules prescribed by the Charter." It was to no purpose that they laid before the Lords their answers to the matters "charged against the Colony of the Massachusetts Bay." Nor would it probably have availed anything had Massachusetts been ever so humble, and expressed her readiness to yield to all his Majesty might require. The Charter was doomed; and orders were sent to and received by Randolph, commanding him to return to England and "prosecute a Quo Warranto."[1]

Sept. Dec. 20.

Upon the receipt of these advices, the community was widely and extensively agitated. Intelligence had reached the country that a general war had been declared against all corporations, and that many cities had submitted and surrendered their franchises. Bermudas, in the plantations, and London and Oxford alone had refused.[2] And should Massachusetts join with the former or with the latter? The question was one in which all were interested. Even the moderate party were friendly to the Charter; and the body of the people were sincerely attached to it. Their all was at stake here. It was for this they had left England, and fled to the wilderness. It was for this they had encountered both peril and distress. It was for this they had submitted to the severest privations. It was for this they had contended with the difficulties incident to all new settlements. For more than fifty years, it had been the sheet-anchor of the colony; its refuge from oppression, tyranny, and wrong. With the shield of its protection planted firmly before them, they had succeeded in defeating

[1] Randolph's Narr., in Usurpation Papers, vol. 2. fols. 218–20; Mather MSS., vol 6. fols. 56, 61; Chalmers, Ann., 413, 450–61.

[2] Mather MSS., vol. 6. fol. 64.

the machinations of their enemies, and had rapidly and steadily advanced in power. And now that the wilderness was subdued, and was ready to blossom; now that their homes had been reared, and their churches had been planted, and everything indicated that a career of unexampled prosperity might be theirs, should they surrender that instrument which had secured these blessings? — endeared to them by the toils and the tears of their fathers, whose dust seemed to call to them, from the soil with which it had mingled, to remember the struggles and the trials of the past?

Is it surprising that a question so vital was earnestly discussed? The farmers in the country talked of it at their hearthsides; the people of Boston pondered it in their warehouses, discussed it upon the Exchange, and in the halls of legislation. It went with them to the church, and was the burden of their prayers. The clergy were aroused, and their opinions and arguments, on the one side and the other, were given in writing, or uttered in public; and, as they had ever been loyal to the colony, so now for the last time they declared themselves irrevocably in favor of adhering to the Charter.[1]

That no means might be spared, however, to prevent the consummation of the evil which threatened them, an address was agreed upon by the General Court, and another was prepared and sent throughout the colony, to be signed by all the inhabitants who were in favor of retaining the Charter. The first document the agents were at all events to present; the latter they were to use or not, as seemed to them best; and they were instructed to deliver up the deeds of the province of Maine, if required; but they were to make no concessions of privileges conferred upon the colony by Charter.

[1] See Oakes's Election Ser., 1673: "Keep to your patent," &c.

CHAP. XVII. 1682.

At the suggestion of Cranfield, the Governor of New Hampshire, who was then on a visit at Boston,[1] another step was taken, which was unwise and unfortunate. Pretending great friendship to the colony, and promising to represent its loyalty in the most favorable light, he advised that their agents should be authorized to wait upon Lord Hyde, and tender him an acknowledgment of £2000 for his Majesty's private service. It was well known that in the English Court everything was then venial; Chalmers himself admits that, had the affair been "dexterously" managed, it "would have probably proved successful;"[2] and it was known that France had succeeded in bribing the King to betray the political interests of his subjects. Hence the proposition of a *douceur* to his Majesty appeared not so absurd as it might under other circumstances; and the colonists, in their dilemma, unwarily fell into the trap which their cunning enemy had purposely set for them; for, no sooner had they adopted his advice, than he infamously denounced them as rogues and rebels, and made such sport of their folly, that the agents complained of the contempt which was heaped upon them, and of the ridiculous position in which the country was placed.[3]

May 28, 1683. Jun. 13.

The fate of the Charter was now sealed. Randolph, who arrived in England in May, brought before the Committee of Plantations his "articles of high crimes and misdemeanors" against the Massachusetts Colony; the Lords of Trade presented a report affirming that sufficient powers had not been given to the agents of the colony, and advising that a Quo Warranto should be issued; the King approved this report, and directed such a writ to be drawn by Sir Robert Sawyer, the Attorney General; for its more effectual prosecution, Mr. Randolph was required to attend with

[1] A letter, relating to his appointment, may be seen in the Hinckley MSS., vol. 1. fol. 36.

[2] Revolt, 1. 133.

[3] Hutchinson, 1. 303, note; Chalmers, Ann., 413; Hallam, 461–2.

such "articles, witnessess, and proofs" as he might be able to produce;[1] and in due time the Quo Warranto issued, with a declaration from the King that "if the Colony, before prosecution, would make full submission, and entire resignation to his pleasure, he would regulate the Charter for his service and their good, and with no further alterations than should be necessary for the support of his government here." The agents of the Colony, as may well be supposed, were in no little perplexity; and, unwilling with their limited powers to undertake the defense and management of so important a case, they petitioned for liberty to return home, "to take charge of their private affairs." This request was granted; and it was ordered that they should be discharged from further attendance, and be allowed to leave the kingdom "so soon as Mr. Edward Randolph, (who is forthwith going thither upon his Majesty's service upon his Majesty's commands) shall be embarked for his said voyage."[2]

CHAP. XVII. 1683. July 26. July 20. Oct. 23?

Three months later, the agents returned to report the result of their mission; and in the course of the same week Randolph arrived, with his Quo Warranto, and two hundred copies of the proceedings against the Massachusetts Charter, and one hundred copies of those against the Charter of London, sent over by advice of the Privy Council for general distribution.[3] The Governor and a portion of the Assistants, satisfied that resistance was hopeless, were inclined to submit; and accordingly voted "not to contend with his Majesty in a course of law," but that an address should

Oct. 26. Nov. 15.

[1] Randolph's Narr., in Usurpation Papers. vol. 2. fols. 218–20; 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 293-4; Chalmers, Ann., 414, 462.

[2] Orders in Council, in 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 294–5.

[3] Randolph, Narr., in Usurpation Papers, vol, 2. fols. 218–20, say he arrived in N. Eng., Oct. 17; but in his Lett. to Gov. Hinckley of Plymouth, dated Oct. 29, 1683, in Hinckley MSS., vol. 1. fol. 49, he says he arrived at Boston on the previous Friday, which was the 26th. See further, Mather MSS., vol. 3. fol. 46; Blathwayt's Lett., in Hinckley MSS., vol. 1. fol 48; Orders in Council, in 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 295.

CHAP. XVII. 1683.

be forwarded to him, declaring their resolution to send agents empowered to receive his commands; and for suing a default for non-appearance upon the writ of Quo Warranto, it was resolved that meet persons should be appointed and empowered by letters of attorney to appear and make defense, until the regular agents could make their appearance and submission.

This vote, to which the Deputy Governor and other of the Assistants objected, was referred by the magistrates to the deputies for their consent; and, after a fortnight's consideration, and protracted debates, it was returned, endorsed: "the deputies consent not, but adhere to their former bills."[1] It is intimated by Hutchinson that, "had this been made an act of the General Court, upon the revolution they might have reassumed their Charter, as Rhode Island and Connecticut did their respective Charters, there having been no judgment against them;"[2] but the correctness of this intimation has been doubted.

Nov. 30.

The people of Boston sustained the deputies; and at a Town meeting, held to consider the King's declaration, Increase Mather, then President of the College, nurtured in the ancient faith of the Puritans, and one of its oldest and firmest defenders, full of zeal, and richly furnished by study and reflection,—a man who, for twenty years, exerted a greater influence upon the fortunes of Massachusetts than any other in the same length of time,— delivered a speech against the surrender of the Charter which was both powerful and effective.[3] "I verily believe," said he, "we shall sin against the God of Heaven, if we vote an affirmative to it. The Scripture teacheth us otherwise. That which the Lord our God has given us, shall we not possess it? God forbid that we should give away the inheritance of our fathers. Nor would it be wisdom for us to comply.

Jan. 21, 1683 4.

[1] Mather MSS., vol. 3. vol. 46; Hutchinson, 1. 304–5; Chalmers, Ann., 414; 3 M. H. Coll., 1. 74–81.

[2] Hutchinson, 1. 305.

[3] Robbins, Hist. Second Church Boston., p. 49.

If we make a full and entire resignation to pleasure, we fall into the hands of men immediately; but if we do not, we still keep ourselves in the hands of God: and who knows what God may do for us? The loyal citizens of London would not surrender their charter, lest their posterity should curse them for it. And shall we then do such a thing? I hope there is not one freeman in Boston that can be guilty of it!" CHAP. XVII. 1683-4.

The effect of such an appeal was wholly irresistible. "Many of the people fell into tears, and there was a general acclamation, We thank you, sir! we thank you, sir!" And when the question was put to the vote, it was unanimously rejected. "It is better," was their conclusion, "if we must die, to die by the hands of others than by our own."

Under these circumstances, a letter of attorney was sent to Mr. Humphreys to appear and answer for the colonies, and addresses were forwarded to the King one after another urging forbearance. But entreaty and remonstrance were equally vain. Randolph, who left for England in December, bearing the intelligence of the proceedings of the General Court, arrived at Plymouth in February, after a "dangerous voyage," in which the vessel was wrecked, and his goods were lost; and being "commanded to prosecute the Boston Charter,"[1] a *scire facias* was issued, upon which a conditional judgment was entered, and it was forwarded by Mr. Dudley, and communicated to the Governor, who called a special Court to consider the same: — but before the Court assembled, the day of grace had passed. No other answer therefore was attempted, but an humble address; judgment was entered up,—"the validity of which has been questioned by a very great authority,"—and a

Dec. 14 1683.

Feb. 14, 1683-4.

Apr. 16.

Jun. 18.

Sept.,

Oct. 23.

[1] Randolph's Narr., in Usurpation Papers, vol. 2. fols. 218–20. He was the bearer of despatches from Plymouth for a Charter for that Colony. See Hinckley MSS., vol. 1. fols. 39, 52, 53, 62, 63.

CHAP. XVII.

copy of the instrument was received the ensuing Summer.[1] Thus tyranny triumphed, and the Charter fell. This was the last effective act of Charles the Second relative to Massachusetts; for before any new government could be settled, the Monarch was dead. His death and that of the Charter were nearly contemporary.

Jun. 2, 1685.

[1] Chalmers, Ann., 415; Revolution in New England Justified, p. 4, in Force, vol. 4, Tract 10. Also the "Brief Relation," 5–6, in ibid., Tract 11, and Narrative of the Miseries of New England, p. 2, ed. 1775. The exemplification of the Judgment against the Charter, is given in full in 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 246–78; and the Letter of the King, relative to the writ of *scire facias*, an exceedingly valuable document, may be seen in the Mass. Archives, Colonial Papers, vol, 2. fols. 38–44.

CHAPTER XVIII.

UNION OF THE COLONIES.

CHAP. XVIII.

THE accession of James II. to the English throne, took place in February 1684–5; and immediately upon its occurrence, Mr. Blathwait, one of the principal Secretaries of State, wrote Mr. Bradstreet recommending his Majesty's proclamation in Massachusetts; and, as dutiful subjects, his Majesty was proclaimed, though "with sorrowful pomp," at the Town House in Boston, in the presence of the eight military companies, and "three vollies of cannon" were discharged on the occasion.[1]

Feb., 1684-5.

Apr. 20, 1685.

The condition of the colony had long awakened the gloomiest apprehensions. The Charter, the cherished palladium of their rights, and "the hedge which kept them from the wild beasts of the field," had been ruthlessly destroyed. It was evident that despotism had marked them for its victims. They could hope for no mercy from any of the Stuarts, for harshness and tyranny were ingrained in their natures. Their worst fears seemed confirmed, therefore, when, before the death of Charles, it was reported that Kirke, the ferocious and detestable Governor of Tangier, and infamous at a later date as the associate of Jeffreys, had been appointed their Governor.[2] There were all the symptoms in the country of an expiring constitution. Several of the towns had refused to send depu-

Nov., 1684.

[1] Hutchinson, 1. 306; Chalmers, Ann., 417. King James was proclaimed in Plymouth, April 24. Hinckley MSS., in Mass. Hist. Soc., vol. 2. fol. 4. Prince, in ibid., fol. 2, speaks of a Lett. to Gov. Hinckley, directing the proclamation of the King, which he supposes to have been lost.

[2] Hinckley MSS., vol. 2. fol. 10; Hutchinson, 1. 307, and Coll., 542, 549.

CHAP. XVIII. 1685. ties to the General Court, and little was transacted by that once active body. Resentment was shown towards those magistrates who had favored the surrender of the Charter; Dudley, Richards, and Brown, were dropped, and Cooke, Johnson, and Hutchinson, were chosen in their stead; Mr. Bradstreet, though re-elected, had less votes than usual; and others of the former officers were treated with neglect. In 1685, the indifference was still greater, and a change in the government was daily expected.

May 12, 1686. The election for 1686, passed without enthusiasm. Mr. Dudley being set aside, Mr. Stoughton, from complaisance to him, declined serving. The people sullenly awaited Jan. 30. 1685-6. intelligence from abroad. Already had news been received that a frigate was to be sent by his Majesty, with commission for a new governor;[1] and it was a relief to the people, when the Rose frigate arrived, to find that Joseph May 14. 1686. Dudley was appointed President by the King, instead of Kirke.[2] It was the substitution of a lesser evil for one infinitely greater.

The General Court was then in session; a copy of his May 17. commission was presented and read; and a reply was May 20. returned, complaining of its arbitrariness, and that the people were abridged of their liberties as Englishmen; "but if you are so satisfied therein," was its closing language, "as that you hold yourselves obliged thereby, and do take upon you the government of this people, although we cannot give our assent thereto, yet we hope we shall demean ourselves as true and loyal subjects to his Majesty, and humbly make our address to God, and in due time to our gracious prince for our relief."[3] With this reply, and

[1] Mather MSS., vol. 6. fol. 2.

[2] Randolph's Narr., in Usurpation Papers, 2. 218–20; Hutchinson, 1. 306–7. The Commission to Dudley and his associates, was issued Oct. 8. 1685. Council Rec's., in Mass. Ar., fol. 4.

[3] Usurpation Papers, 1. 1; Inter-Charter Papers, 1. 208; Hutchinson, 1. 307–8; Chalmers, Ann. 418; 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 179; 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 234–5. This paper was afterwards complained of as "libellous." Council Rec's., fols. 19, 20.

the appointment of a Committee to take charge of all papers relating to the Charter, and titles of lands, the assembly adjourned, and the deputies returned in sadness to their homes, to spread among their neighbors the discouraging news. CHAP. XVIII. 1686.

A few days later, the President and Council met; the exemplification of the judgment against the Charter was read in open court, "in the presence of divers of the eminent ministers, gentlemen, and inhabitants of the town and country," with his Majesty's commission to the new government; the President took the oath of allegiance; and the officers being seated, a speech was delivered by Mr. Dudley, in which, after referring to the allegiance which it was hoped would be shown, he proceeded to say: "The necessary alterations in the rule and form of his Majesty's government, from the method late used by the government while it stood by the charter, as they need be but a few, so we assure you shall with all care and prudence be continued as plain and as easy as is possible, and we shall hasten humbly to lay them at his most gracious Majesty's feet, for his allowance and confirmation."[1] At the close of this speech, a Proclamation was read, setting forth his Majesty's Commission, which was "published by beat of drum and sound of trumpet," and ordered to be sent to every town;[2] a few days later, an address was drawn up, to be sent to Mr. Blathwait, for his Majesty, by Mr. Mason, one of the Council, with a letter to the Lords Commissioners of Foreign Trade and Plantations;[3] Randolph served his writs of Quo Warranto against Rhode Island and Connecticut;[4] and the New England Colonies, having lost the freedom which they had so long enjoyed, May 25.

[1] Council Rec's., fols. 1–4.
[2] Council Rec's. fol 4.
[3] Council Rec's., 21–4, 31.
[4] Randolph's Narr., in Usurpation Papers, 2. 218–20.

CHAP. XVIII. 1686.

were destined to experience the rigors of a despotism, the more galling from its contrast with their former liberties.

Despair, however, was never a trait of the Puritan character; and, though the friends of Episcopacy welcomed the new administration with "outward expressions of joy and satisfaction," and "many seemed well pleased at the change," the "independent faction" still prevailed; the "independent ministers" did not hesitate, even in their pulpits, to "speak treasonable words;" and the former magistrates were not without hope, "either by some unhappy accidents in the state of affairs at home, or some dissensions among the members of the government, they might prevail so far as to dissolve the new constitution, and reassume the old." Of the persons composing the Colonial Council, but two, Randolph and Mason, were avowed Episcopalians; most of the officers and justices of the peace were "congregational men;" Dudley himself pretended to sympathize with the latter;[1] and not above three "Church of England men" were officers in the militia.[2] For these reasons, the churches of the colony were not immediately disturbed, but continued their worship and discipline as before; and the affairs of the town were managed much as formerly. Randolph, the Secretary of the Council, had indeed proposed that the Plymouth colony should be taxed for the support of Episcopal worship; that one of the three meeting houses in Boston should be "ordered to be set apart for the exercise of the religion according to the church of England;" and that twenty shillings weekly should be paid out of the contributions of each society to defray the charges of an Episcopal church; but, though such a church was gathered this

[1] See his speech, Council Rec's., fol. 3.

[2] Randolph, in Hutchinson, 1. 314; 3 M. H. Coll., 7. 154–6; Hutch. Coll., 549-51; Council Rec's., fols. 22, 23. The Castle of Boston, a "place of great importance to the country," was "put under the care and command of Capt. Wait Winthrop." Council Rec's.

year, of which Mr. Ratcliffe was the minister, whose communicants are said to have amounted to "near 400 persons," we have seen no proofs that the proposition for its endowment prevailed.[1] The courts of justice were continued as usual, Mr. Stoughton being at their head;[2] and trial by jury was allowed even in the courts of admiralty; but, as the jurors were returned by the marshall, and could be packed, very different verdicts were given from those under the old administration. As a general thing, and with but few exceptions, indeed, the old laws, so far as they related to judicial affairs, were adopted as the rule of proceeding, although the government which framed them was dissolved.[3] Mr. Dudley did not consider himself a permanent President, but only as appointed to prevent confusion until the King's pleasure should be further known; and Randolph took the same view of his commission, as serving only to "unhinge the commonwealth which for many years was usurped and managed by a faction," and constantly urged the appointment of a General Governor, "without which," says he, "all that is already done will be of very little advantage to his Majesty's interest."[4]

Between Dudley and Randolph a coolness had already sprung up. The former, having made Randolph the "trumpeter of his attachment to the prerogative," began to throw off the mask, and to treat him with neglect; and the latter, in return, though he had once strongly advocated the appointment of Dudley as Governor General, now vilified him, in several letters written to London soon after his arrival.[5] Mr. Stoughton became the principal confidant

[1] Council Rec's., 23, 46; Randolph, in Hutchinson, 1. 314, 319, and Coll., 550.

[2] He was also Deputy President. Council Rec's., fols. 9, 61.

[3] Council Rec's. fols. 25, 26–8, 33–4; Hutchinson, 1. 316; Chalmers, Ann.

[4] Letter, in 3 M. H. Coll., 7. 155.

[5] See his Lett. of July 26, 1684, in Mather MSS., vol. 3. fol. 69

CHAP. XVIII. 1686.

of Dudley; and, as he "was not suspected by the body of the people of being unfriendly, or of want of strong attachment to the religious principles and to the ecclesiastical constitution of the country, and his compliance, in taking a share in the administration, was charitably supposed to be, at least in part, for the sake of keeping out oppressors and tyrants," this favoritism was acquiesced in, and no uneasiness was felt in consequence. Dudley professed an equal attachment to the interests of the colony, and was equally desirous of retaining the public favor; but, as his course in England was well known, and was in striking contrast with his present servility, the people were not so charitable as to believe him sincere, and he was generally regarded with suspicion and dislike.[1]

Dec. 19. At length the dreaded change came; and in the depth of winter, his Majesty's frigate Kingfisher arrived on the coast, and Sir Edmund Andros, a "poor knight of Guern-

Dec. 20. sey," glittering in scarlet and lace, landed at Boston as "Captain General and Governor in Chief" of all New England, with "companies of soldiers brought from Europe to support what was to be imposed" upon the colony, and "repeated menaces that some hundreds more were intended."[2] His Commission, "more illegal and arbitrary than that of Dudley and Empson, granted by Henry the Seventh," has been preserved;[3] and its powers were sufficiently full and despotic. He was authorized to remove members of his Council at his discretion, though vacancies were to be filled under the King's sign-manual; with the

[1] Hutchinson, 1. 315.

[2] Boston Declaration, 7. in Force, vol. 4, Tract 10; Chalmers, Ann., 421, Revolt, 1. 179. The soldiers who came with Andros, were lodged at the Castle, and at Fort Hill, in "Mr. Gibbs's house." Usurpation Papers, vol. 1. fol. 205; Council Rec's., fol. 106. For Dudley's proceedings, in anticipation of the arrival of Andros, see Council Rec's., 90. According to the same, fol. 105, Andros landed on Monday, Dec. 20.

[3] Rev. in N. E. Justified, 8, 40, in Force, vol. 4, Tract 9; Narr. Miseries of N. E., 3.

consent of this Council laws might be enacted, which were to be transmitted to England within three months of their passage for the royal approval; former taxes and imposts were to be continued until new ones were levied; the currency was subjected to his regulation, though no mint was allowed; the oath of allegiance was to be administered to all; pardoning and reprieving powers were conferred upon the Governor, and all judicial proceedings were entrusted to him and his Council, who were to erect courts, and appoint judges, from whose decisions an appeal to the King was allowed; the militia and forts were placed under their control; martial law could be executed in times of insurrection or war; commerce was subjected to their regulation; liberty of conscience was to be allowed to all persons, *especially Episcopalians* who were to be "particularly countenanced and encouraged;" the marriages which had been solemnized by the magistrates were confirmed; and it was very plainly intimated, though not openly avowed, that the whole real property of the country was to be assumed into the King's hands, and that all "lands, tenements and hereditaments" were to be disposed of, and granted to, such persons, and on such terms as his Majesty saw fit to appoint.[1] One of these powers,—that of levying taxes,—Sir William Jones, the eminent Orientalist, thoroughly versed in literature and law, and holding the office of Attorney General, protested against as illegal. "The

[1] Usurpation Papers, vol. 1. fols. 7–16, 161; 3 M. H. Coll., 7. 139–49; 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 295–6; Chalmers, Ann., 419; Force, vol. 4, Tract 8. This Commission is dated June 3. 1686, and embraced Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Plymouth, and the Narraganset country. Chalmers, Ann., 419–21, does not speak of it in terms of very high praise, and admits that its "form was altogether arbitrary," though its "essence," he adds, "was favorable to real freedom;" a paradox which he does not attempt further to elucidate. The seal of the new Governor, bore the remarkable motto: "Nunquam libertas gratior extat;" yet every thing connected with his commission is characteristic of the folly and infatuation of the powers by whom he was sent.

CHAP. XVIII 1686. people of Massachusetts," — such was his bold avowal, — "notwithstanding the forfeiture of their charter, are English subjects, invested with English liberties; and you can no more grant a commission to levy money on them without their consent in an assembly, than they can discharge themselves from their allegiance."

Dec. 20. The day of the arrival of the new Governor, "being landed," he "repaired forthwith to the Town House, attended thither by a great number of merchants and others, with all the militia of horse and foot;" and having, in a "short speech," informed them that "his Majesty by Commission of June 3, had appointed him Captain General," a temporary order was issued that all officers, both civil and military, should be continued as before; and the

Dec. 21. next day, application was made by members of Ratcliffe's society for one of the meeting houses in which religious services might be performed in the Episcopal manner; but the use of either of the houses was denied, though a meeting was allowed to be held in the "east end of the Town House."[1] The "Common Prayer and the Surplice" were yet "novelties in New England."[2]

Dec. 22. On the following day, the Council convened; letters were written to Rhode Island and Connecticut demanding the surrender of their Charters; and orders were given that "all the members of the late government should be summoned to meet at Boston, on Thursday, the 30th

Dec. 30. instant." At that date they assembled; their names were called; and their places assigned them according to his Majesty's instructions. The King's Commission was then read, with the additional instructions of September 13, to receive the charter of Rhode Island and Providence Plan-

[1] Usurpation Papers, vol. 1. fol. 164; Council Rec's., 105; 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 237; 3 M. H. Coll., 7. 164-6; Hutch. Coll., 550; Sewall, in Holmes, 1. 421.

[2] Dunton, in M. H. Coll., and in Drake's Boston, 472-3.

tation; the oath of allegiance, and the oath for the due administration of justice were tendered; "his Excellency in a short discourse encouraged the members to freedom in debate;" and it was "moved that a Proclamation should be made throughout all the Colonies and Provinces of the Government, that all officers, both civil and military, should be continued in their places of trust, and that the laws not repugnant to the laws of England, should be, and observed during his Excellency's pleasure."[1]

This beginning of the administration of Andros awakened a momentary gleam of hope. The Governor was loud in his professions of regard to the public good, and was apparently disposed to conduct the affairs of the colony with discretion and prudence. The majority of his Council were of "the moderate party" in the old government, under which, perhaps, they would gladly have continued had the charter been preserved. But, as a change had taken place, they were not very anxious to quarrel with their own interests; and their former pliancy was deemed a sufficient pledge for their present subserviency. For some of them, it is certain, Sir Edmund had no particular affection; and, had they been less willing to comply with his wishes, they would probably have been displaced, and others appointed in their stead. But the subornation of insincerity had become so common under the government of the Stuarts that the taint of corruption had spread even to these shores. Preferments were lavishly loaded upon

[1] Council. Rec's., 105, 106–7; Usurpation Papers, vol. 1. fols. 159, 160, 165, 167, 168, 175–6, 187–8, 205–13; Narr. Mis. N. E., 2, 3, ed. 1775: 2 M. H. Coll., 8. 181–2; 3 M. H. Coll., 7. 166–8; 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 297–8; N. E. Gen. Reg., 4. 322.—Randolph, Narr., in Usurpation Papers, vol. 2. fols. 218–220, says he received a second writ of Quo Warranto against Connecticut on the 28th of Dec., 1686, and served it on the 30th, and they made submission; and on the 25th of Oct. 1687, Sir Edmund went to Hartford, and erected his Majesty's government there.

CHAP. XVIII. 1686.

strangers; and Palmer, Brockholt, Mason, Usher, and Randolph, of the Council, and West, the Secretary, one of the "abject crew" from New York, with Dr. Bullivant, a warm Episcopalian, and Grahame, the lawyer, became the principal confidants and advisers of his Excellency. It was upon them that he relied for success in his measures; "for his Excellency," says Randolph, "has to do with a perverse people."[1]

A large portion of the records of this period are unfortunately missing from the Archives of the State; yet from authentic documents, which exempt us from the necessity of "retailing political fictions as indubitable truths,"[2] we learn, that, after the first full meeting of the newly organized Council, many of the members returned home, only those resident in Boston and its vicinity being constant in their attendance. But complaints were soon heard that "the governor had always three or four of his creatures to say yes to everything he proposed, after which no opposition was allowed."[3] And it was apparent to all, except, perhaps, Quakers, and Episcopalians, who had little to complain of, that the former professions of his Excellency were but a cloak to conceal his real views; for a series of measures followed, as vexatious and tyrannical as any to which men of English descent had ever been exposed. It seemed as if the ghost of Charles the First had taken possession of Sir Edmund, and was hurrying him on with hot haste to work out his own ruin, and to drive the people to the verge of desperation.

Jan. 4, 1686-7.

One of his first acts, was to levy a tax of twenty pence on each poll, and one penny in the pound upon "all the late Colonies and Provinces, towards defraying the public

[1] 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 298; Rev. in N. E. Just., 52; Boston Decl'n., 7, 8; Bancroft, 2. 425.

[2] Chalmers, Ann., 422.

[3] Hutchinson, 1. 317; Revolution Just., 55; Boston Decl'n., 10.

charges of the government."[1] This tax, on account of the mode of its assessment, and its manifest illegality, produced great excitement; some of the Council had the courage to oppose it; petitions were presented from a number of towns to be excused from its payment; and others refused to comply with its demands.[2] Shadrach Wilbur, the Town Clerk of Taunton, was imprisoned for protesting against this act; the towns of Rowley, Salisbury, Haverhill, and Andover were fined for their contumacy;[4] and the principal men of Ipswich were apprehended and prosecuted for a similar offense. The treatment of the latter was peculiarly oppressive. They were thrust into jail as vile incendiaries, denied the right of Habeas Corpus, and overruled to answer at a court of Oyer and Terminer at Boston, with Dudley, Stoughton, Usher, and Randolph as their judges, Farwell as the Attorney of the government, and a packed jury, "most of them non-freeholders of any land in the colony, and some of them strangers and foreigners, gathered up, as was supposed, to serve their present turn." The defendants pleaded the "repeal of the law of assessment on the place, the Magna Charta of England, and the Statute Laws, that secure the subject's properties and estates." But Dudley, with a haughtiness equal to that of James the First, insolently replied: "You must not think the laws of England follow you to the ends of the

Aug 30,

Sep. 15.

[1] Council Rec's., 109; Rev. Just., 13, 53–4; Narr. Mis. N. E., 4, 8; Usurpation Papers. vol. 2. fol. 209; 3 M. H. Coll., 7. 171. None of the laws of Andros seem to have been printed; an act of policy on his part, which was afterwards of benefit to him on his trial. A paper, however, is published by Chalmers, Ann., 465–6, which confirms the statement of the text of the burden of the taxes assessed; and the sums there stated are such, in comparison with the previous charges of the colony, that we do not wonder at the complaints of oppression.

[2] 3 M. H. Coll., 7. 171. Chalmers, Ann., 422, concurs in censuring this law, and in praising the conduct of those who resisted it.

[3] Rev. Just., 14; 3 M. H. Coll., 7. 190. The Mittimus against Wilbur, is in Usurpation Papers, vol. 2. fol. 59.

[4] Rev. Just., 14; Inter-Charter Papers, vol. 1. fols. 131, 134, 147-8; Usurpation Papers, vol. 2. fols. 96, 97, 105, 145, &c.

CHAP. XVIII. 1687.

earth. You have no more privileges left you, than not to be sold as slaves. Do you believe Joe and Tom may tell the king what money he may have?" Then, turning to the jury, he added: "I am glad there be so many worthy gentlemen, capable to do the King's service, and we expect a good verdict from you, seeing the matter hath been so sufficiently proved against the criminals." A "good verdict" was returned, and fines and disabilities speedily followed. Need we be surprised that the people exclaimed, "The wicked walk on every side, and the vilest men are exalted!"[1]

The assessment of a tax, however, was not the only act
1686-7. of which the people complained. A revision of the laws,
Jan. 28. which had been proposed, was arbitrarily rejected;[2] the press was again restrained, and it was ordered that copies of all books to be printed, should first be perused by Mr. Dudley, and, upon his allowance, one copy, attested by him, should be brought to the Secretary's office, to be left on record, and to receive from him an imprimature.[3] A restraint was also placed upon marriages, and none were allowed to marry without entering into bonds with sureties to the government, to be forfeited in case there should
Mar. 23. afterwards appear to have been any lawful impediment.[4] The design was likewise renewed of encouraging the estab-

[1] Inter-Charter Papers, vol. 1. fols. 127, 136, 139, 144; Narr. Mis. N. E. E., 4; Usurpation Papers, vol. 2. fols. 93–4, 98, 101–4, 147; Rev. Just., 13–17; Boston Decl'n., 8; Bancroft, 2. 427; Felt's Ipswich, 123–5.

[2] Rev. Just., 53; Inter-Charter Papers, vol. 1. fols. 187–92; Usurpation Papers, vol. 1. fols. 206, 271; and vol. 2.

[3] Council Records, 111; Usurpation Papers, vol. 1. fol. 224; 3 M. H. Coll., 7. 171.

[4] Usurpation Papers, vol. 1. fols. 202, 226; 3 M. H. Coll., 7. 170. We doubt the correctness of the statement of Grahame, Colon. Hist., 1. 261, and Hildreth, Hist. U. S., 2. 111, that the celebration of marriages was confined to the Episcopal clergy, of whom there was but one in the province; and that it was necessary to come to Boston in order to be married. Such a course was *proposed* by Randolph, but we have seen no evidence that it was *adopted*; and the local records of our country towns conclusively prove the contrary, unless the law was generally evaded there. Comp. Hutchinson, 1. 318.

lishment and growth of the Episcopal Church; and, as it was a supererogation of merit to break down the colonial churches, Randolph was sent by the Governor to demand the key of the South Church, that "prayers might be said there." A Committee was immediately appointed, of which Sewall was one, to wait upon his Excellency and remonstrate; and, as on a former occasion, this Committee replied: "We cannot, with a good conscience, consent that our meeting house should be made use of for the Common Prayer worship." But the remonstrance was of no avail; for two days after, the house was opened; and though "Goodman Needham had resolved to the contrary, he was prevailed upon to ring the bell, and open the door at the Governor's command."[1] Nor was this all. In the following year the proposition to tax the colonists for the support of Episcopal worship was revived; and the people were desired to contribute towards the erection of a church: but the uncompromising Sewall replied, with great pungency, "The bishops would have thought strange to have been asked to contribute towards setting up New England churches." A request that he should sell land on "Cotton Hill" for the location of a church, met with a similar rebuff, because, he said, "he would not set up that which the people came from England to avoid; and besides, the land was entailed."[2] Land, however, was obtained, and a church was erected before Andros was driven from the country; and thus, for the first time, the Episcopalians as a sect gained a permanent foothold in the Massachusetts Colony.[3] The determination of the bishops and others in England to introduce the Church of England here, contrary to the wishes of the people, was quite as much an act of persecu-

CHAP. XVIII.

1686-7. Mar. 23.

Mar. 25, 1687.

1687-8.

Mar. 21.

[1] Mather MSS. vol. 7. fol. 15; Hutchinson, 1. 319; Sewall, in Holmes, 1. 421, and in Drake's Boston, 469.

[2] 3 M. H. Coll., 1. 84.

[3] Danforth's Lett., in Usurpation Papers, vol. 3. fol. 143; Drake's Boston, 470.

CHAP. XVIII.

tion, as the resolution of the Puritans to exclude such worship from their community. Each party was exclusive in its views at that time; and both parties, it is to be hoped, have since imbibed a more tolerant spirit.

The arbitrariness of the government increased every day. Feb. 15, 1686-7. Excise laws were passed, and rigorously enforced; and spies and informers might be found in every town.[1] Persons were forbidden to leave the country without permission, lest complaints should reach England, and redress of public grievances be sought.[2] The form in which oaths were to be taken, by laying the hand on the Bible, was regarded by the Puritans as an idolatrous custom; yet such as refused to take them in that form, were fined and imprisoned.[3] Under the old charter, the fees of officers had been exceedingly moderate: under the new they became exorbitant. Fifty shillings were exacted for the probate of a will, and widows and children were compelled to May 25, 1687. travel to Boston, on all business relating to the settlement of estates, whither all public records were ordered to be removed.[4] The Governor was supreme ordinary, and acted by himself, except a few months whilst he was in New York, and in the Eastern country, when Mr. Dudley served as his Deputy. The harpies quarrelled among themselves about their share of the prey. "West," says Randolph, "extorts what fees he pleases to the great oppression of the people, and renders the present government grievous." And Randolph was not behind West in similar extortions; for, from his commission as Secretary, he expected all the

[1] Rev., Just., 13, 39; Inter-Charter Papers, vol. 1. fols. 129, 133, 135, 176, 182, &c. The bill for these laws was brought in Jan. 3., and the same were to be in force after Jan. 10; but they were not carried into effect until Feb. Usurpation Papers, 1. 41–6, 206; Council Rec's, 108.

[2] Rev. Just., 12, 55.

[3] Mather MSS., vol. 7. fol. 14; Boston Decl'n., 9; Hutchinson, 1. 320.

[4] Council Rec's., 122; Usurpation Papers, vol. 1. fols. 38, 157, 225, 238, 240; vol. 2. fol. 128; 3 M. H. Coll., 7. 162.

Clerkships in the country, and had actually farmed his office to the very man of whose exactions he so loudly complains.[1]

But the greatest profit arose from land patents. Although King James is said to have commanded that "their several properties, according to their ancient records," should be continued to the people,[2] yet the commission to Andros intimated the intention of his Majesty to assume the whole real property of the country into his own hands, and that all "lands, tenements, and hereditaments" were to be disposed of, and granted to, such persons and on such terms as the monarch saw fit to appoint; and, as the charter was now annulled, the people were plainly told that "their lands were the king's;" that their titles were worthless; that the grants from the General Court had not been made under the seal of the colony, which was a "notable defect;" and that all who "would have any legal titles to their lands, must take patents of them, on such terms as they should see meet to impose."[3]

In the management of this business, however, caution was necessary, for "What people," it was asked, "that had the spirits of Englishmen, could endure this? That when they had at vast charges of their own conquered a wilderness, and been in possession of their estates forty, nay, sixty years, that now a parcel of strangers, some of them indigent enough, must come and inherit all that the people now in New England and their fathers before them, had labored for."[4] Hence, though writs of intrusion were issued, all titles were not questioned at once; and the fees

[1] Usurpation Papers, vol. 3. fol. 29; Council Rec's., 117, 123; Hutchinson, 1. 321, and Coll., 557; Rev. in N. E. Just., 36–9; Narr. Mis. N. E., 5. For table of Fees, see Usurpation Papers, vol. 1. fol. 244, and vol. 2. fol. 122, appointment of West.

[2] Bancroft, 2. 428. We suspect Mr. Bancroft mistakes here the Declaration of Charles II., for that of James II. See Boston Decl'n., 9.

[3] Rev. Just., 18, 56; Narr. Mis. N. E., 5; Mather MSS., vol. 7. fol. 14.

[4] Rev. Just., 18.

CHAP. XVIII.

were varied according to circumstances, though sometimes as high as £50.[1] Very soon, however, the wolves of rapine became more clamorous, and began to push matters to greater extremities. "All the inhabitants of Boston," wrote Randolph, as the business proceeded, "will be forced to take new grants and confirmations of their lands, which will bring in vast profits;"[2] and writs as "many as a cart could hold," were threatened to be issued.[3] The friends of the old charter of course experienced the worst treatment; the friends of the new government were dealt with more leniently. There are hundreds of petitions on file, for the confirmation of estates, principally from persons of the latter class.[4] Randolph and his satellites, with characteristic eagerness, sought for their share of the spoils. The poor were grievously oppressed. And property became every day more precarious. If any resolved to defend their titles by law, they were told by Sir Edmund's Attorney that it should cost them all they were worth, and something besides.[5] And Wiswall, of Duxbury, the minister of the town, though suffering by disease, was punished for abetting a claim in his own colony.[6]

Aug. 25, 1687.

In vain did the people plead that, if these exactions were continued, the country would be ruined. "It is not for his Majesty's interest you should thrive," was the answer. In vain did Lynde, and Hutchinson, and others, produce Indian deeds as original titles. They were told such titles were "worth no more than the scratch of a bear's paw."[7] Even the records of Lynn were pronounced "not worth a rush."[8] If "the men of Massachusetts did

[1] Rev. Just., 26.
[2] Rev. Just. 36.
[3] Rev. Just. 22.
[4] Usurpation Papers, at the State House, in 4 vols. large folio.
[5] Rev. Just., 26; Hutchinson, 1. 422–3.
[6] Rev. Just. 27.
[7] Inter-Charter Papers, vol. 1. fol. 169.
[8] Inter-Charter Papers, vol. 1. fol. 183. Lewis, Hist. Lynn, chap. 8, gives interesting particulars of the oppressions which that town experienced under the arbitrary sway of Andros.

much quote Lord Coke," they were defeated by Andros, who was a lawyer of some talent. If John Higginson, of Salem, went back to the book of Genesis, and, remembering that "God gave the earth to the sons of Adam and Noah to be subdued and replenished," declared that the people of New England held their lands "by a right of just occupation from the grand charter of God, as well as by purchase from the Indians," Andros, incensed at this denial of his power, tauntingly replied, "either you are subjects or you are rebels."[1] Lands reserved for the poor, and for the uses of education, were coveted by favorites. In Plymouth and in Massachusetts the harpies were equally exacting. Juries were packed, and justice was perverted. "Our condition," said Danforth, "is little inferior to absolute slavery." "The governor," says Mather, "invaded liberty and property after such a manner, as no man could say anything was his own."[2] Even a woodshed could not be built in Boston, without the permission of the Governor.[3] CHAP. XVIII. March, 1688-9.

Nor was this all. The maintenance of the gospel was impaired and neglected; the schools of learning fell into decay; invasions were made upon the rights of the College; and the municipal rights of towns were trampled upon or withheld. To the agents of tyranny, it was excessively annoying "to behold poor coblers and pitiful mechanics, who had neither home nor land, strutting and making noe mean figure at their elections, and some of the richest merchants and wealthiest of the people stand by as insignificant cyphers;" and hence the vote by ballot was rejected; to a committee from Lynn, Andros replied, "there is no such thing as a town in the whole country;" Mar. 16, 1687-8.

[1] Inter-Charter Papers, vol. 1. fol. 145.

[2] Rev. Just., 18-24, 55-6; Boston Decl'n., 9-10; Bancroft, 2. 428-9.

[3] Usurpation Papers, vol. 2. fol. 24. This may have been a necessary regulation, to prevent danger by fire. Council Rec's., 28-9.

CHAP. XVIII.

and to assemble in town meeting, for purposes of deliberation, was esteemed an act of sedition and riot.[1] Personal liberty and established customs were alike disregarded. The Governor, with four or five of his Council, levied what taxes they pleased. No hopes were entertained of a restitution of their charter privileges. If any petitioned for redress of their grievances, complaints to his Majesty were represented as useless. The condition of the country was gloomy in the extreme.[2]

Oct. 22, 1688.

Mar. 23, 1687-8.

Meanwhile the whole seaboard, from Maryland to the St. Croix, was united into one extensive despotism, and, as a reward for his compliance with the demands of the King, the entire dominion, of which Boston was the capital, was abandoned to Andros, the Governor General, and to Randolph, his Secretary, with his needy associates.[3] But the eastern part of Maine had already been pillaged by Palmer and West, who, to use Randolph's language, had been as "arbitrary as the Grand Turk;" and in New York there was little good to be done, for the people had been "squeezed dry by Dongan."[4] Hence the impoverished state of the country disappointed avarice; and Andros, upon the arrival of his new Commission, which was "published with great parade from the balcony of the Town House," hastened to the South to supercede Dongan, and assume the government of New York and New Jersey.[5]

July 19, 1688.

Apr. 18, 1688.

Before his departure, however, he issued a Proclamation for a day of Thanksgiving, to be observed on the 29th of

[1] Council Rec's., 154; Narr. Mis. N. E., 4; Rev. Just., 12; Hutchinson, 1. 324; Bancroft, 2. 426.

[2] Rev. Just., 12, 55; Hutchinson, 1. 323; Inter-Charter Papers, vol. 1. fols. 187–92, statement of some of Andros's Council.

[3] Orders in Council, in 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 298; Chalmers, Ann., 425; Bancroft, 2. 431. The date of Andros's new commission is Ap. 7, 1688, in Usurpation Papers, vol. 4. fol. 72.

[4] Rev. Just., 36–8; Hutch. Coll., 564–5.

[5] Usurpation Papers, vol. 4. fol. 72, where is the Proclamation of Andros. See also Hutchinson, 1. 332; Bancroft, 2. 431.

April, for the "pregnancy of the Queen."[1] Such an event, in Old England, was celebrated with marks of the liveliest joy; but in New England, little interest was felt in the matter. Hence it was a grief to our fathers, when the appointed day arrived, that Allen, the pastor of one of the churches in Boston, from the literal version of the improved Bay Psalm Book, gave out the words of the 21st Psalm to be sung: CHAP. XVIII. 1688.

"Jehovah, in thy strength
And joy in thy salvation
Thou grantest hast to him
And thou hast not withholden back
The king shall joyful be,
How vehemently shall hee!
That which his heart desired,
That which his lips required."

The course of Mr. Willard was more highly approved; for while, before prayer, he read, among other notices, the occasion of the Governor's gratitude, and, after Puritan usage, interceded largely for the King, he "otherwise altered not his course one jot," and, as the crisis drew near, goaded the people with the text, "Ye have not yet resisted unto blood, warring against sin."[2]

In the midst of the distresses of the people, the ministers of the colony, at the head of whom stood Increase Mather, the "great metropolitan clergyman of the country," were generally faithful, and openly and boldly condemned the tyranny and oppression of their rulers, — preaching rebellion, and planning resistance. Mather had opposed the surrender of the charter, and for this cause was hated by Andros and his minions. Randolph often speaks of him as one of the "factious," and he had even the audacity, personally or by another, to forge a letter in his name,[3] as "full of treason as an egg of meat," which was pretended to be forwarded to England by a circuitous route, and

[1] Mather MSS., vol. 7.—Bancroft, 2. 432, mistakes in dating this the 7th of April. Staples, Ann. Prov., 178, gives the right date.

[2] Bancroft, 2. 432.

[3] Probably some time in 1687, as Mather's Lett. in reply, is dated Jan. 24, 1687–8.

CHAP. XVIII. 1688.

afterwards intercepted, and shown to Sir Lionel Jenkins, whose conduct was censured in it; but Jenkins either suspected the forgery, or had the good sense to treat the letter with contempt, — only asking whether "that star gazer wrote it," — so that Randolph failed of his aim.[1]

The feelings of the people at this date were highly exasperated; yet before the storm burst, it was resolved to make one effort to excite the clemency of the King; and, by the consent of part of the civil and nearly all the ecclesiastical authorities, Mr. Mather was selected as the fittest person to be entrusted with this mission. The consent of his church was asked for his absence; and when the subject was proposed to them, he observed: "If you say to me, Stay, I will stay; but if you say to me, Go, I will cast myself on the providence of God, and, in his name, I will go."[2] But, though the church concurred cheerfully in the proposition for his departure, it was no easy matter to escape the vigilance of Randolph, who had instigated

Dec. 24, 1687.

Dudley to issue a warrant for his arrest. At length, after hiding in disguise for some time, and changing his dress as he went from house to house, with the help of his friends

Apr. 7, 1688.

he was conveyed on ship board in the night, and sailed for England.[3] Great anxiety was felt for the success of his mission, and several letters were written him by his friends urging him to undertake it.[4] The Declaration of Indul-

Apr. 4, 1687.

gence of the King had been received in the colony some

Aug. 24, 1687.

time before; but when the ministers of Boston had agreed with their congregations solemnly to praise God for the same, Andros "entertained them with threatening words,

[1] Mather MSS., vol. 7. There is an admirable and discriminating notice of Increase Mather, in Robbins's History of the Second Church, Boston, in which justice is done to the memory of the man.

[2] Robbins, Hist. Sec. Ch., 51; N. E. Gen. Reg., 2. 16.

[3] Chalmers, Ann., 424; Prince, in Mather MSS., vol. 7. The writ is in ibid., vol. 6. fol. 58.

[4] See Letters from Jno. Cotton, of Mar. 8, S. Mather, of Mar. 9, and Jno. Bishop, of Mar. 20, in Mather MSS., vol. 7.

saying it was faction in them, and bade them meet at their peril, and that he would send soldiers to guard them and their meeting houses." Yet some suspected the object of this Declaration, and Mr. Danforth proposed that, in the address to the King, no mention should be made of his proclamation, as it was not absolutely necessary, and dangerous rocks would be shunned thereby. But other counsels prevailed, and addresses were sent, not only from Massachusetts, but from Plymouth; and these, with letters from several congregations, relating to the same subject, were duly presented,[1] with petitions from Plymouth and Massachusetts, and from "the dissenters of New England," complaining of the usurpations of Andros; setting forth the grievances which the people had sustained in consequence of the measures of the Governor, in wresting from them their lands, removing the records from Plymouth to Boston, and compelling the Probate of all wills to be attended there; and beseeching his Majesty that "there may be no laws or taxes on us without a General Assembly, as is granted to some of the plantations in America."[2]

CHAP. XVIII. 1687. Nov. 8.

The enterprise before Mr. Mather was nearly a hopeless one. The monarch was advancing rapidly in despotism in England, and how could he be expected to favor liberty in the colonies? Yet the messenger, nothing daunted, kept on his way, and, being joined in London by two persons who had been formerly Assistants under the charter, Samuel Nowell, and Elisha Hutchinson, a remonstrance was presented to the King. Mr. Richard Wharton, one of the new Council, concurred in this remonstrance; and father Peters, the royal confessor, is said also to have aided it; but all was to no purpose. At first, indeed, with the

1688. June 1.

[1] Mather MSS., vol. 6, fols. 44, 45, 46, 47, 50; vol. 7. fols. 13, 14; Hutchinson, 1. 320; Chalmers, Ann., 426; Council Rec's., 134.

[2] Mather MSS., vol. 7, where the Petitions from Plymouth may be seen. See also Hutchinson, 1. 328–30.

CHAP. XVIII. 1688.

consent of Powis, the Attorney General, a report was agreed upon by the Committee of Foreign Plantations, in which an assembly was mentioned; but the clause was stricken out by Lord Sunderland before the report was presented.[1]

At this stage of affairs, a new movement occurred, destined to effect important changes in Europe and America. This was the revolution, by which the reign of the Stuarts was brought to an end, and the House of Hanover became the possessors of the English throne. For the accomplishment of this revolution, the nation was as much indebted to those who dissented from the Anglican Church, as to its more moderate friends of the whig aristocracy. It was the fruit of opposition to ecclesiastical as well as political despotism. Puritans, Quakers, Presbyterians, and all who were in favor of toleration, saw, in William of Orange, the ablest Protestant Prince in Europe, one in whom they confided for the redress of their spiritual grievances; and the liberal nobility saw in him one to redress their civil wrongs. There was a blending together of the interests of men who had hitherto acted separately, and who had been immeasurably jealous of each other's ascendancy; and out of these combined forces grew up the whig party, the

[1] Narr. Mis., N. E., 6–8; Hutchinson, 1. 328; Chalmers, Ann., 426-7, 466–8. Chalmers asserts that his Majesty was pleased to declare, upon the petition of several aged persons of New England, that he would grant "full and free liberty of conscience and exercise of religion, and their several properties and possessions of houses and lands, according to their ancient records; and also their College of Cambridge, to be governed by a president and fellows, as formerly; all to be confirmed to them under the great Seal of England." And he likewise says that "the approach of the Prince of Orange" alone "prevented the execution of what had been thus humanely promised." How much credit is to be given to these assertions, we are unable to say. If the "aged persons" here alluded to were freemen of the colony, the conduct of the King was manifestly at variance with his general policy towards Massachusetts; and as the authority which we quote is that of an usual pleader against the colonies, we incline to the opinion that the petitioners were dissidents, and hence the favor with which they were treated.

patrons of liberty, in distinction from the tories, the patrons of despotism. CHAP. XVIII. 1688.

Yet the downfall of the Stuarts was hastened by the infatuation and folly of the Monarch; and the withdrawal of his favor from the national hierarchy sealed his doom. Throughout the nation, the way was prepared for the elimination of the old dynasty, and the introduction of a new. "Tories took the lead in inviting the Prince of Orange to save the English Church; the whigs joined to rescue the privileges of the nobility; the Presbyterians rushed eagerly into the only safe avenue to toleration;" and the bulk of the people acquiesced in their measures. Without bloodshed James the Second was hurled from his throne, and William, the Stadtholder of Holland, welcomed by all, assumed, in the right of his wife, the sceptre which had fallen from the grasp of his father-in-law, and was proclaimed the lawful Sovereign of England.[1]

The news of the projected invasion of England seems to have reached Boston in the winter of 1688; for a proclamation was then issued by Sir Edmund Andros, commanding all officers, civil and military, and all other of his Majesty's loving subjects to be in readiness, upon the approach of any fleet or foreign force, to use their utmost endeavors to hinder any landing or invasion that might be intended.[2] But the tidings of the success of the Prince of Orange did not arrive until the following spring; and, while the people were agitated by rumors from Pemaquid, Mr. John Winslow landed from a ship from Nevis, with the "Prince's Declaration."[3] Directly Mr. Sherlock, the Sheriff of Governor Andros, was despatched to demand his papers; and

Jan. 10, 1688-9.

Apr. 4, 1689.

[1] Burnet, Hume, Macaulay, Bancroft, &c.

[2] Rev. Just., 10.

[3] The letter of the Prince of Orange, to the Lords spiritual and temporal, of Jan. 22, 1688–9, and the address of the Lords, in reply, with other documents on the same subject, were printed in Boston by R. P. for Benj. Harris, at the London Coffee House, in 1689, on a folio sheet; and a copy of this document, which is probably unique, is in the possession of S. G. Drake, Esq.

CHAP. XVIII. 1689. accompanying the officer to his Excellency, the Governor inquired why he had not brought him the news? Mr. Winslow replied, he was not aware it was his duty to do so. The surrender of the Declaration was then required, and refused; at which Andros was so exasperated that he caused him to be imprisoned, notwithstanding he offered bail to the amount of £2000.[1]

But neither the imprisonment of the messenger, nor the mandate of the Governor, could delay for a long time the outburst of popular fury and indignation. The flame, which had been smouldering, "fanned by the agents in England," burst into a blaze. There was a "general buzzing among the people, great with expectation of the old Charter."[2] The preachers had already matured a revolution. And two days after Andros had written to Brockholt, acquainting him with the agitation which prevailed, everything was ready for the gathering struggle.

Apr. 18. At eight o'clock on the morning of that day, rumors were spread that the town was rising, and that Andros intended to fire it at one end, and Capt. George at the other, and "then go away in the smoke for France." Within an hour, as Capt. George, the commander of the Rose frigate, stepped on shore, he was surrounded by Green and the ship carpenters of Boston, and secured as a prisoner in the house of Mr. Colman. An alarm was then given. Boys ran through the streets with clubs in their hands encouraging one another to fight; and a dense crowd gathered, ready to act as occasion required. Sheriff Sherlock endeavored in vain to quiet the multitude: — he was arrested without ceremony. Proceeding to the Major of the regiment, colors and drums were demanded. The officer resisted: they threatened. Companies hastily formed

[1] Rev. Just., 11, 12; Hutchinson, 1. 333; Inter-Charter Papers, vol. 2. fols. 216, 218.

[2] Chalmers, Ann., 429, 469.

under Nelson, Foster, and Waterhouse; by ten o'clock Bullivant, Foxcroft, and Ravenscroft were seized; and before noon White, Farwell, Broadbent, Crawford, Larkin, Smith, and others, were hurried to jail. Mercey, the old jailor, was taken into custody, and "Scates the Bricklayer" took his place. Bradstreet, Danforth, Stoughton, Richards, Cooke, and Addington, of the old magistrates, were brought to the Council House by a company of soldiers under Capt. Hill; and thither the other companies were speedily gathered, with Captains Shrimpton and Winthrop, who had been of Sir Edmund's Council. Dudley's son, and Col. Lidget escaped to the fort. Andros, who was already there, with Randolph, West, Palmer, and a few more, sent young Dudley to request an interview with Mr. Joyliffe and the ministers of the town. But Allen, Moody, Willard, and Cotton Mather, declined his summons. At mid-day the people reinstated the old magistrates as a council of safety. The whole town was in arms, "with the most unanimous resolution that ever inspired a people;" and a Declaration, read from the balcony of the the Court House, defended the insurrection as a duty to God and the country. "We commit our enterprise," were its closing words, "unto the blessing of Him who hears the cry of the oppressed, and advise all our neighbors, for whom we have thus ventured ourselves, to join with us in prayers and all just actions for the defense of the land."[1]

A shout went up from the multitude as the Declaration finished; the jack was set up at the fort; and a pair of colors floated at Beacon Hill, to give notice abroad that the struggle was begun. Oliver and Eyres were next sent to the fort to demand its surrender. Sir Edmund refused. It was now two o'clock. The regular Lecture for the day was postponed. People from the country came thronging

[1] This declaration is in Force, vol. 4. Tract 10. See Chalmers, Ann., 430, and Neal's N. Eng., 2. 433.

CHAP. XVIII. 1689.

into the town; on Charlestown side over a thousand soldiers were ready to cross; and twenty military companies were marshalled in Boston streets.

The Rose frigate, upon intelligence of these proceedings, hoisted her colors, and opened her ports; and, under the command of her Lieutenant, who swore he would die before she should be taken, preparations were made for a vigorous defense. About four o'clock, a boat was espied making from the frigate to the fort; and a company hastening thither to watch her movements, it was ascertained that Governor Andros, and those who were with him, were purposing to escape. The boat was accordingly seized, and found to be filled with small arms, and hand grenades, and a quantity of match. The Governor, disappointed, once more withdrew; and the soldiers dividing, part came up on the back side of the fort, and part went underneath the hill to the lower battery, or sconce, where "the red-coats" were, who, immediately upon their approach, fled for safety. Andros rebuked them for not firing, and even beat some for their cowardice. Seizing the guns of the sconce, these were pointed at the fort, and a surrender demanded by Nelson, the leader of the troops. This was refused until West and another should go to the Council for instructions; and at their return, Andros came forth unarmed, and, through the very streets where he had first displayed his scarlet coat and his arbitrary commission, he and his followers were marched to the Town House. Here he was received by the aged Bradstreet; and Stoughton, acting as spokesman for the rest, told him "he might thank himself for the present disaster that had befallen him." Thence, under guard, the prisoners were conducted to the house of Mr. Usher, where they were detained for the night.

Apr. 19. On the following day, the people came swarming across the Charlestown and Chelsea ferries, headed by Shepherd,

a schoolmaster of Lynn; and two colonels were sent to demand the surrender of the castle. The principal cry was against Andros and Randolph; but it was conceived there was no safety so long as the castle and the frigate were on their side. The commander of the former, John Pipon, at first refused to yield; but on being informed that he would be "exposed to the rage of the people" if he persisted, he consented, though with curses, and the command of the same was entrusted to Capt. Fairweather.

By this time the guns of the fort, and of the ships in the harbor, were brought to bear against the frigate; and the valiant Lieutenant, notwithstanding his threats, deemed it prudent to surrender. Thus the new government was overthrown, and the people were delivered from its iniquitous oppressions! The next day a portion of the prisoners were sent to the Castle, and a council of safety and peace was organized, of which the venerable Bradstreet, the sole surviving associate of Winthrop, an indefatigable magistrate of sixty years standing, still in a green old age, though his head was silvered with the frosts of eighty-seven winters, was chosen president; Isaac Addington was elected secretary; Wait Winthrop was intrusted with the command of the militia; officers were placed in the several ports; and John Foster and Adam Winthrop were appointed Treasurers.[1]

Apr. 20

The Charter was not immediately resumed, though town meetings were recommended to be held before the news arrived of the proclamation of William and Mary. Exceptions might have been taken to this step while the former decree was in force; and many, who were conscious of

May 2

[1] The authorities are the Tracts, in Force, vol. 4; Hutchinson, 1. 334–40; Mather MSS., vol. 7. fols. 82, 84; Revolutionary Papers, fols. 1, 2; the Inter-Charter Papers, vol. 1. fol. 90; and the letter from Capt. George, in Chalmers, Ann., 469–70. Palmer, Grahame, West, and Trefroy were sent to the Castle, Apr. 20, and Sir Edmund Andros on the 7th of June.

CHAP. XVIII. defects in the charter, preferred to wait for a settlement from England. Yet sixty-six persons met, from forty-three towns, and desired the Council of Safety to continue their station for two weeks; and at that date, a meeting of the representatives of fifty-four towns was held in Boston, and forty at least voted in favor of resuming the charter. The Council opposed the measure, and the people of Boston were divided in opinion; but, after two days debate, the Governor and magistrates, chosen in 1686, signed a paper signifying their willingness to take conditional charge of the government according to the rules of the charter, for the conservation of the peace and safety of the people, until an orderly settlement arrived from England.[1]

1689. May 9. May 22. May 24.

Apr. 22. In the meantime, tidings of the proceedings at Boston had spread to Plymouth, and Nathaniel Clark, the agent of Andros, was seized and imprisoned, and Hinckley, the former governor, resumed his place. In both colonies, the government of Andros was deposed without bloodshed: — a remarkable circumstance, when we consider how highly the people were exasperated. Joseph Dudley was absent when these events transpired, holding a Court on Long Island. It was at Newport that he first heard what had been done; and receiving letters the next day, advising him to delay his return, he passed over privately to Major Smith's, at Narraganset, where a party of a "dozen young men" took him prisoner, and conducted him to Boston.[2]

Apr. 21.

Connecticut speedily followed the example of Massachusetts, and her Charter was brought forth from its hiding place in the Oak. Rhode Island was more tardy in her movements, and nearly a year elapsed before a new government was organized. The colonies at the South, after a

May 9.

Feb. 26, 1689-90.

[1] Hutchinson, 1. 385; Chalmers, Ann., 430; Neal's N. Eng., 2. 444–7; Mather MSS., vol. 7. fol. 85; Revolutionary Papers, fols. 8, 14–27, 37–41, 53.

[2] Rev. Just.

little hesitation, imitated New England; and America was delivered from the despotism of the Stuarts. Would the new dynasty be more favorable to the liberties of the colonies? This was a question which time only could solve.[1]

A little more than a month from the overthrow of Andros, a ship from England arrived at Boston, with news of the proclamation of William and Mary. This was joyful intelligence to the body of the people. The magistrates were at once relieved from their fears, for the revolution in the Old World, justified that in the New. Three days later, the proclamation was published with unusual ceremony. The Governor and Council, the civil and military officers, merchants of the town, and gentlemen from the country, mounted on horseback, paraded the streets; the troops were under arms, marshalled by their captains; salvos of artillery, from the fort and the castle, awakened loud echos in the suburbs and upon the waters; a great entertainment was provided at the Town House; wine flowed freely; and throughout all the settlements the rejoicing was great.[2]

May 26, 1689.

May 29.

A week later, the representatives of the several towns upon a new choice met at Boston, and proposals were made that charges should be forthwith drawn up against Andros, or that all the prisoners but Andros should be liberated on bail; but both propositions were rejected.[3] The representatives likewise urged the unconditional resumption of the Charter, declaring that they could not act in anything until this was conceded. Many opposed the motion; but it was finally adopted; and it was resolved that all the laws in force May 12, 1686, should be continued until further orders. Yet

Jun. 5

Jun. 6.

Jun. 11.

Jun. 6.

[1] For the Proceedings in N. Y., see Doc. Hist., vol. 2. p. 3, et seq.

[2] Hutchinson, 1; Chalmers, Ann., 431.

[3] Revolution Papers, fols. 84, 108, 151. Dudley and others afterwards presented several petitions to be liberated on bail. Rev. Papers, fols. 103, 119, 204; Inter-Charter, Papers, vol. 1. fols. 42, 48, 49, 51, 118.

CHAP. XVIII. 1689.

the magistrates, conscious of the insecurity of the position they occupied, used prudently the powers entrusted to them. Scurrilous pamphlets, which, when Endicott was alive, would have subjected their authors to the heaviest penalties, were published with impunity by the minions of Andros. And even the magistrates themselves, in their address to the crown, felt it necessary to apologize for some of their proceedings.[1]

The first advices from England were somewhat encouraging, and hope revived. But subsequent despatches were much less favorable.[2] Mr. Mather was still in London as the agent of the colony, and, upon the overthrow of James, he was introduced by Lord Wharton to the Prince of Orange, and congratulated him upon his happy accession to the crown, and humbly implored his favor to New England. "I will show them," was the reply, "all the favor in my power." "But I doubt," it was added, "there have been irregularities in their government." "If so, they shall be reformed," was the rejoinder of the agent. "And I'll be their guarantee," added Lord Wharton; "We two will stand bound for New England, that they shall act regularly for the future." "Then," continued the King, "I will forthwith give order, that Sir Edmund Andros shall be removed from the government of New England, and be called unto an account for his mal-administration. And I will direct that the present King and Queen shall be pro claimed by the former magistrates." "Sir," replied the agent, "they will do it with the joyfullest hearts in the world."

Mar. 14, 1688-9.

Anxious for the restoration of the old Charter and its privileges, under which the colony had prospered so well, the agent applied himself diligently to that object, advising

[1] Revolution Papers, fols. 87, 94, 99, &c.; Inter-Charter Papers, vol. 1. fols. 77, 78, 100, and vol. 2. fol. 125; Mather MSS., vol. 7. fol. 90; Hutchinson, 1. 355–6.

[2] Hutchinson, 1. 346, note.

CHAP. XVIII. 1689.

with the wisest statesmen for its accomplishment. It was the concurrent judgment of all, that the best course would be to obtain first a reversion of the judgment against the Charter by an Act of Parliament, and then apply to the King for such additional privileges as were necessary. Accordingly, in the House of Commons, where the whole subject of seizing Charters in the reign of Charles the Second was up for discussion, the Charters of New England were inserted with the rest, and, though enemies opposed the measure, it was voted that their abrogation was a grievance, and that they should be forthwith restored. Thus the popular branch of the government acted favorably towards the colonies; but, as the bill was yet to be submitted to the House of Lords, great pains were taken to interest that branch in the measure, and at the same time, letters having arrived giving an account of the proceedings in Boston, another interview was held with the King, before whom, in a "most excellent speech," Mr. Mather "laid the state of the people;" and his Majesty was pleased to signify his acceptance of what had been done in New England, and his intention to restore the inhabitants to their ancient privileges; but "behold," adds the narrative, "while the Charter Bill was depending, the Convention Parliament was unexpectedly prorogued, and then dissolved, and the Sisyphæan labor of a whole year came to nothing."[1] All that was obtained was an order that the government of the colony should be continued under the old Charter until a new one was settled, and a letter from the King was forwarded to that effect, with an order, signed by

March to August.

July 4.

Aug. 12

July 30.

[1] Extracts from Mather's Lett. of Sep. 2, and other documents, in Inter-Charter Papers, vol. 1. fol. 83.—"It would greatly silence contemners of our authority," says Broughton, Lett. to Mather of Ap. 2. 1690, Inter-Charter Papers, 1. 378, "to have our charter confirmed by our King and Parliament. I pray endeavor to do as much as you can for its accomplishment, for evils vented in evil words fret as a canker, and make government uneasy."

CHAP. XVIII. 1689.

the Earl of Nottingham, for the delivery of Sir Edmund Andros, and the others detained with him, who were to be sent to England for trial.[1]

These letters did not reach Boston until late in the year; and meanwhile a scheme was devised for the escape of Andros, who succeeded in outwitting his guards near midnight, and fled to Newport, Rhode Island, where he was again apprehended, and, after an absence of eight days, returned to the castle. The arrival of the King's orders, and the placing a strong guard at the castle stopped further attempts; the old government was confirmed, and the obedience of the people required; and, after orders had been passed to that effect, by the first opportunity the prisoners were sent to England in the ship Mehitabel, Gilbert Bant, Master. Against Mr. Dudley the resentment of the people was deep and determined; and in his own letters, to Governor Bradstreet and others, he complains of "unwarrantable treatment" and "barbarous usage."[2]

Aug. 2.

Dec., 3 to 6.

Feb. 9, 1689-90.

As it was probable that no means would be spared by the friends of Andros to effect his liberation, and as affairs in the colony were yet in an unsettled state, the General Court concluded to send additional agents to join Mr. Mather and Sir Henry Ashehurst; and Elisha Cooke and Thomas Oakes, two of the Assistants, were selected for that purpose. A Committee was likewise appointed to collect information against Andros and his associates, and

Dec. 6.

[1] Mather, in 1 M. H. Coll., 9. 245; Council Orders, in 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 298, 299; Hutchinson, 1. 346–8; Inter-Charter Papers, vol. 1. fols. 83, 100, 221.

[2] Letters of Coggeshall, Sandford, Church, Walley, Clarke, &c., with the replies, in Rev. Papers, fols. 248, 249, 250, 255, 256; Inter-Charter Papers, vol. 1. fols. 36, 41, 49, 51, 90, 100, 104, 108, 149, 157, and especially 221; Hutchinson, 1. 349, and notes. It was on the 15th of June, that a guard of fifty soldiers was ordered at the Castle, viz: Boston, 16; Charlestown, 4; Roxbury, 4; Dorchester, 6; Milton, 2; Braintree, 4; Weymouth, 2; Cambridge, 2; Cambridge Village, 1; Hingham, 3; Watertown, 2; Woburn, 2; and Malden, 1; and it was this guard probably that Andros outwitted. Revolution Papers, fol. 121.

another to draw up letters to be sent to England; a large number of depositions were taken, setting forth the arbitrary proceedings of the usurped government, and the grievances of which the people complained; and orders were given the agents to obtain, if possible, a full confirmation of the ancient Charter rights and privileges.[1] 1688. Dec. 5 and 13. Jan. 24, 1689-90.

Upon the first appearance of the new agents before the Council, Sir Edmund and his associates had notice to be present; but the papers containing the charges against them not being signed by the proper authorities, advantage was artfully taken of this defect to quash further proceedings. Sir Robert Sawyer declaimed against the colony; and Sir John Somers and other Lords spoke in its defense; but the Lord President, the Marquis of Caermarthen, was not unwilling to side with the former, and, turning to the agents, he said: "Gentlemen, here has been a pretty deal of time spent. My Lords will give his Majesty a true and impartial account of what has been said on both sides, and you may withdraw." The next day Sir Edmund and the rest were discharged; his Majesty approved the decision of the Council; the matter was ordered to be fully dismissed; and an Order having been passed by the Board of Trade for persons from New England and New York to meet them at Whitehall on the business of New England, both Andros and Randolph presented charges against the colony,—the former censuring the people for the subversion of his government, and the insurrection in which they had engaged; and the latter complaining of irregularities in trade since those events transpired: but all these charges were fully answered, to the satisfaction of the colonists, if not to the King.[2] Thus the instruments of tyranny escaped unharmed; and to com-

Apr. 17, 1690. May 29. May 30.

[1] For this Order, and their instructions, see Inter-Charter Papers, vol. 1. fols. 180, 181. The Committee appointed to draw up information against Andros, consisted of William Stoughton, Bartholomew Gedney, and William Browne, Esq. Inter-Charter Papers, 1. 155.

[2] Inter-Charter Papers, vol. 2. fols. 90, 96–100; 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 303.

CHAP. XVIII. 1690.

plete the work of intrigue and duplicity, Sir Edmund obtained the government of Virginia, where he conducted himself prudently; Mr. Dudley was appointed Chief Justice of New York; and Randolph received an appointment in the West Indies.[1] It is probable that all of them learned wisdom from misfortunes.

From the disposition of the next Parliament, nothing favorable to New England was expected; and, having failed in procuring a writ of error in judgment, to be brought out of Chancery into the Court of King's Bench, all hopes of the restoration of the Charter were reluctantly relinquished, and application was made for a new grant, which should confirm the privileges of the old instrument, and such in addition as the experience of the people had taught them would be of benefit. A petition was presented for this purpose by the Earl of Monmouth, formerly Lord Mordent, a firm friend of New England; and, by the intercession of another eminent personage, the King was prevailed upon to refer the affairs of New England to the two Lords Chief Justices, and the Attorney and Solicitor General, all of whom were supposed to be friendly to the applicants. Mr. Mather was permitted to attend their meetings, and the heads of the old Charter, and that to Sir Ferdinando Gorges were presented in writing, with such additions as were prayed for, which were submitted to the

Jan. 1, 1690-1.

King, and by him sent to the Council, and thence transferred to the Committee for Plantations.[2]

The departure of the King for Holland delayed proceedings for a season, and in the meantime, petitions having

Apr. 9, 1691.

been sent in from Boston and Charlestown, and perhaps

[1] Council Orders, in 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 299–301, and Inter-Charter Papers, vol. 2. fol. 10; Rev. Just. 9–10, 50; Hutchinson, 1. 350–1; Inter-Charter Papers, vol. 1. fols. 104, 107, 112, 118–24, 127–148, 152, 166–9, 176–9, 254–276; Mather MSS. vol. 6. fols. 72, 75; Revolutionary Papers, fols. 13, 28, 60–2, &c.

[2] Inter-Charter Papers, vol. 1. fol. 83, and fols. 99–100; 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 301. See also Usurpation Papers, vol. 4. fol. 315.

CHAP. XVIII.

Jan. 25, 1689-90

from other towns, by those opposed to the government of the colony — "scarce any of whom were the issue of the first planters" — and an address from Maine, in favor of Sir Edmund Andros, expressing grief at the insurrection in the colony, and the conduct of the Council of Safety, replies were prepared by Mr. Mather,[1] who, indefatigable for the interests of his country, published his "Reasons for the Confirmation of Charter Privileges granted to the Massachusetts Colony," and dispersed them among the Lords of the Privy Council, whom he personally waited upon to solicit their favor. The non-conformist clergy of England interested themselves generally in behalf of the colony, as did also a number of distinguished noblemen; Lord Wharton, the last surviving member of the Westminister Assembly, was unwearied in his efforts; and even the noted Dr. Tillotson, the archbishop of Canterbury, and Gilbert Burnet, bishop of Salisbury, who stood high in favor with King William, interceded in their behalf. Through the favor of Madame Lockart, Mr. Mather was likewise admitted to an interview with the Queen, of whose condescension he speaks in the highest praise; and at the return of the King from Holland, two more conferences were held with him.

There were other parties in interest, however, besides Massachusetts, who were anxious to obtain a charter of the King; and, as Mr. Wiswall of Duxbury was present at Boston when the new agents embarked for England, he was desired to accompany them in behalf of the Plymouth Colony, though he was furnished with no credentials by the magistrates of that jurisdiction. It was designed in England to include Plymouth in the government of New York; and when Slaughter was appointed Governor of the

[1] Inter-Charter Papers, vol. 1. fol. 185, and vol. 3. fol. 171; Revolution Papers, fols. 75, 76; 4. M. H. Coll., 2. 301–2; Frothingham's Charlestown, 230–4. The whole of Mr. F.'s 23d chapter relates to the Usurpation affairs, and contains many important facts.

CHAP. XVIII. 1690. latter Province, Plymouth was put into his commission; but, chiefly through intercession of Mr. Mather, the commission was altered, and an order was issued to the Lords Chief Justices Holt and Pollexfen, and to Treby and Somers, the Attorney, and Solicitor General, to draw up a new charter for Massachusetts, to which Plymouth was to be joined. Mr. Wiswall, in obedience to his constituents, vehemently opposed this step. The Solicitor General, highly incensed, struck Plymouth out, and the design of its annexation to New York was revived. Intelligence of this design was not long in reaching America, and the people of Plymouth were greatly alarmed. Yet, with singular pertinacity, — though natural enough, perhaps, under the circumstances in which they were placed, — they desired Sir Henry Ashehurst to renew the application for a separate charter, without signifying any preference to be joined to Massachusetts rather than to New York, in case of the failure of that application. Happily, the sentiments of the more prudent were known to Mr. Mather, or Plymouth might have been joined to New York, and the interests of the Pilgrims and Puritans divorced, instead of blended into one; and Mr. Hinckley, the former Governor of Plymouth, 1691. Oct., in his letter to Mr. Mather, expressed the thankfulness of the colony for his intercession in its behalf.[1]

It had been evident for some time, that William and his Ministers had resolved to erect a new government in Massachusetts, which was to be known as the Province of the Massa- Jun. 8. chusetts Bay. The first draught of a charter was objected to by the agents, because of its limitation of the powers of the Governor, who was to be appointed by the King.[2] The July 29. second draught was also objected to; whereupon the agents were informed that "they must not consider themselves as plenipotentaries from a foreign State, and that if they were

[1] Hutchinson, 1. 360–5. [2] 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 302–3.

unwilling to submit to the pleasure of the King, his Majesty would settle the country without them, and they might take what would follow." Nothing remained, therefore, but to decide whether they would submit, or continue without a charter, and at the mercy of the King. Mr. Cook and Mr. Wiswall were opposed to submission; and the latter, in his letter to Gov. Hinckley, says: "All the frame of heaven moves upon one axis, and the whole of New England's interest seems designed to be loaded on one bottom, and her particular motions to be concentric to the Massachusetts tropic. You know who are wont to trot after the Bay horse." But Mr. Mather, concluding that all parties would be best conciliated by submission, wisely assumed the responsibility of consenting to the adoption of the charter as reported, and to him the nomination of officers was left.[1]

CHAP. XVIII. 1691. Nov. 5.

By the terms of this new Charter, the territories of Massachusetts, Plymouth, and Maine, with a tract farther East, were united into one jurisdiction, whose officers were to consist of a Governor, a Deputy Governor, and a Secretary, appointed by the King, and twenty-eight Councillors, chosen by the people. A General Court was to be holden annually, on the last Wednesday in May, and at such other times as the Governor saw fit; and each town was authorized to choose two deputies to represent them in this Court. The choice of these deputies was conceded to all freeholders having an estate of the value of £40 sterling, or land yielding an income of at least 40s. per annum; and every deputy was to take the oath of allegiance prescribed by the crown. All residents of the Prov-

Oct. 7.

[1] Inter-Charter Papers, 3. 99–100; Hutchinson, 1. 365; 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 303.—President Quincy, Hist., H. Coll., 1. 123, speaks in terms of unqualified praise, of the valuable services of Mather in England; and the Letter from the principal Dissenting clergyman of England to the General Court at Boston, bears equally honorable testimony to his "inviolable integrity, excellent prudence, and unfainting diligence." Robbins, Hist. Second Ch. Boston, 54.

CHAP. XVIII. 1691.

ince and their children were entitled to the liberties of natural born subjects; and liberty of conscience was secured to all but papists. Appeals were allowed in all personal actions where the matter in dispute exceeded in value the sum of £300. To the Governor was given a negative upon all laws enacted by the General Court; without his consent in writing none were valid; and all receiving his sanction were to be transmitted to the King for approval, and if rejected at any time within three years were to be of no effect. The Governor was empowered to erect courts, levy taxes, convene the militia, carry on war, exercise martial law, with the consent of the Council, and erect and furnish all requisite forts. Free liberty of fishing was conceded to all the King's subjects; and a reservation of timber was made for the use of the royal navy. In other respects the privileges granted in this Charter were analogous to those granted by Charles the First.[1]

Such was the Province Charter of 1692,—a far different instrument from the Colonial Charter of 1629. That Charter effected a thorough revolution in the country. The form of government, the powers of the people, and the entire foundation and objects of the body politic, were placed upon a new basis; and the dependence of the colonies upon the crown was secured. How far these changes were of benefit to the country, remains to be seen.

May 14, 1692. It was on Saturday, the 14th of May, 1692, that Sir William Phipps arrived at Boston as the first Governor of the new Province. Writs were immediately issued for a

Jun. 8. general assembly, which convened in the ensuing month, and the government was duly inaugurated. There was a strong party, as may well be supposed, who reluctantly submitted to this government; but by a majority it was

[1] See the Charter in full, in the volume published 1814.

accepted, and a day of thanksgiving was appointed for its institution.[1] CHAP. XVIII. 1692.

Thus having traced the dawn of liberty upon the shores of Massachusetts, its fluctuating fortunes, and its apparent eclipse, we must pause at the new era in its political history introduced by the Province Charter, under which a new course is hereafter to be developed. We have seen the people who settled New England, driven from their native land by religious persecution, erecting, in self-defense, upon their arrival in these parts, a system analogous to that which they had repudiated abroad. We have seen the difficulties which grew out of this policy, and the contests in which it involved them for over fifty years. Yet amidst all these obstacles, we have witnessed the steady and prosperous growth of the settlements, their increase in power, in wealth, and in numbers. And we have witnessed also the gradual advancement of light and liberality; the development of higher and broader principles of action; and the diffusion of a more genial and tolerant spirit. Liberty, from the outset, was sacredly cherished. It was yearned for, and sought, as the greatest of all blessings. And the glowing patriotism which prevailed so extensively; the sturdy resistance to all oppression; the jealousy with which popular rights were so earnestly guarded; and the manifest desire to secure and enjoy the highest freedom compatible with the acknowledged allegiance of subjects, are striking and prominent traits in our annals. It is to be borne in mind that, up to this date, with but very slight exceptions, the whole course of events traced in these pages, transpired under the dominion of as arbitrary princes as England ever saw: — princes who trampled upon the constitution they should have cherished; who violated the laws they were

[1] 4 M. H. Coll., 2. 307.

CHAP. XVIII. 1692.

sworn to observe; and who struggled with desperate energy to aggrandize their own power, at the expense of the interests and the liberties of their subjects. If, therefore, the course of our fathers appears at times unjustifiable, when viewed from the stand-point which we now occupy, or inconsistent with the maxims of English jurisprudence, which were then in an unsettled state, we are to consider the circumstances in which they were placed; the ignorance of the age; the difficulties they encountered; the opprobrium which was heaped upon them; and the blindness and bigotry which stamp as well the annals of England as those of America; and to every candid mind these considerations, and others which will naturally suggest themselves, will furnish a sufficient apology for all apparent irregularities, and for excesses which may be regretted if they cannot be wholly excused. There is as little, however, in our annals, which needs an apology, as in the annals of any nation on the face of the globe. Ours is a history as proud as that of the most ancient and privileged monarchies of the old world; and prouder in proportion to the problems which have been wrought here, of the deepest, most thrilling, and vital significance.

APENDIX.

Note A. The MS. here referred to, has since proved to be the original MS. History of Plymouth Colony, by Governor Bradford. The correspondence, for ascertaining this fact, was conducted by Charles Deane, Esq., of Boston; and the Lord Bishop of London very readily consented to place the MS. in the hands of the Rev. Joseph Hunter, to be copied. The transcript will probably be soon received, and the volume will be forthwith issued, under the supervision of Mr. Deane, in the Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society.

Note B. It will be understood, that, in adopting the statement of Morton, relative to the proceedings of the Dutch, we do not design to reflect upon the conduct of the Merchants of Holland, as in every sense unjustifiable. It was doubtless best for our country, that the Dutch should have continued to hold possession of New Netherland, as by that means, the foundations of the City of New York were laid by men of greater commercial energy than the Pilgrims.

FEB 75
N. MANCHESTER,
INDIANA